J. G. Rourke O.P.

CONFERENCES FOR MEN

Intended in Particular for Holy Name Societies

BY

REV. REYNOLD KUEHNEL

JOSEPH F. WAGNER (INC.)
NEW YORK
ST. LOUIS AND LONDON: B. HERDER

Nihil Obstat

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.

Imprimatur

✠JOHN CARDINAL FARLEY

Archbishop of New York

NEW YORK, AUGUST 24, 1917

Copyright, 1917, by JOSEPH F. WAGNER (Inc.), New York

Preface.

By the wise and merciful dispensation of Providence one of the oldest societies of the Church, namely, the Holy Name Society, has had a great revival in our times, when there is such urgent need for a body of devout, well-instructed, and zealous Catholic men.

Organization is the watchword of our age, and organizations must be fostered among the Catholic laity, to oppose and defeat the well-organized assaults upon the Church by her enemies. There is particular necessity for the Parish Priest to promote organization for the good of the Faith among the men of his congregation, and this is best accomplished by gathering them into a Holy Name Society, with regular meetings. At meetings of this kind these Conferences have been delivered by the author, and they are now issued in bookform in the hope that they may be of use particularly to Reverend Directors of the Holy Name Society, by suggesting topics and subject-matter for discourses to the members of their societies.

May St. Joseph, the patron of Catholic men, secure, by his intercession, God's blessing upon these humble efforts, so that they may be fruitful for the welfare of souls, and for the greater honor and glory of God.

The Author.

Feast of the Nativity of
the Blessed Virgin Mary, 1917.

CONTENTS

		Page
I	Introduction	1
II	The Waning of Faith	6
III	The Spreading of Atheism	10
IV	The Social Question	14
V	The Chief Principles of Socialism	18
VI	Can Socialism Claim to be One of Our Political Parties?	22
VII	Fallacies of Socialism — I. Labor Produces All Wealth?	27
VIII	Fallacies of Socialism — II. Property	34
IX	Fallacies of Socialism — III. Equality	40
X	Socialism, the Enemy of Religion	46
XI	Socialism, the Enemy of Our Country	52
XII	Socialism, the Enemy of the Home	57
XIII	Syndicalism	63
XIV	Woman Suffrage	69
XV	True Morality versus Socialistic Morality	76
XVI	Economic Determinism	82
XVII	Surplus Value	88
XVIII	Reform or Anarchy — Which?	93
XIX	The True Position of Labor	99
XX	Duties of the State	104
XXI	Minimum Wage	109
XXII	The Liability Act and Old Age Pensions	114
XXIII	Compulsory Arbitration	120
XXIV	The Duty of Labor	127
XXV	The Failure of Secular Education	135
XXVI	Catholic Education	140
XXVII	The Catholic Taxpayer and the Public School	145
XXVIII	The Influence of Infidelity upon Education	150
XXIX	Infidelity in Politics	156

		PAGE
XXX	United for God and Country	162
XXXI	The Duties of Our Catholic Men in Their Home-Life	169
XXXII	Unity	174
XXXIII	The Pocketbook	178
XXXIV	Charity	183
XXXV	The Right of Life	188
XXXVI	The Training of Children	193
XXXVII	The Forming of Habits	199
XXXVIII	Bending the Will	204
XXXIX	Punishments	210
XL	The Authority of God	216
XLI	School Years	221
XLII	Mistakes in Dealing with Children	226
XLIII	The Training for Work	230
XLIV	Annoyances	236
XLV	Responsibility	241
XLVI	Order	247
XLVII	Vigilance	250
XLVIII	Guidance	254
XLIX	Vocations	259
L	The Man of Faith	266
LI	The Man of Prayer	271
LII	The Man of Honor	275

CONFERENCES FOR MEN

ST. JOSEPH, THE MODEL OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY MANHOOD

I. Introduction

Whatever is true and good never grows out of fashion in this world. The fine sculptures of ancient Greece are as new to-day as when the artists had just finished them. These masterpieces have been the inspiration of countless other artists, who were amply satisfied if they could but imitate them.

In a still greater sense this truth applies to the lives of the saints of God. Their beautiful lives shine forth even centuries after they have passed out of this world, like some wonderful work of art, and they are the models for our imitation.

I wish to call particularly to your mind that great saint, who having lived and died nearly two thousand years ago, is to this day the grand model of Catholic manhood; the saint whose sterling qualities and heroic virtues make him fit especially into our times; whose life and work reveal to us the only solution of the vexing problems and questions of our day! Such, indeed, is the great St. Joseph, the model of the Catholic manhood of this twentieth century.

The life of St. Joseph, so far as our knowledge of detail is concerned, might be put in a few words. These few data, however,

are of sufficient value to build up a figure of such heroic size that its shadow is cast over centuries. Even now the powerful figure of St. Joseph looms up with a force which ages cannot wither. Nor will its greatness be dimmed in a day or a century. In ages yet unborn, when humanity will have to solve other problems and will face other dangers, the life of St. Joseph will convey a lesson and a solution.

People say that history repeats itself, and that like problems demand like solutions. Whatever truth may be contained in this observation, it does seem as though this paganized twentieth century has much in common with pagan Egypt, the dangers and trials of which St. Joseph had to endure during his years of sojourn there.

Egypt was a land of culture and of refinement, where wealth and honors and pleasures dominated in the desires of the people, where arts and sciences gave testimony of advanced intellectual attainments. But all was pagan. False gods brought with them false standards of morality. While the rich wallowed in excesses of every description, the poor were virtually, if not actually, but slaves. The oppression of the few was answered by the hatred and discontent of the many. Such was the godless environment in which St. Joseph had to dwell until an angel bade him take the Child and Its Mother back to the land of his fathers.

Our twentieth century, with all its culture and refinement, with all its achievements in arts and sciences, all its wonders of inventions, differs little from that pagan age of Egypt in this respect that then as now we find a hostile attitude to the one true God. The Godless spirit is instilled in the hearts of millions of the men and women, and the evil consequences of an atheistical philosophy of life are inevitable. True it is, that people no longer offer incense and sacrifice to images of wood or stone; but who can

deny that people are following strange gods? Money, political honors, unlawful pleasures, are the gods of our day, to whom people bend their knee too readily. The drift toward paganism outside of the true Church is unmistakable. Sciences that in the love of truth should be a reflexion of the infinite truth and wisdom of God have, like ships in a storm, been torn from their safe moorings, and then drift helplessly on the treacherous sea of doubt and denial. Do not some of our leading scientists endeavor to show that for the existence of life, of force and of matter, a creating God was not necessary? Do they not try to show by all means that the idea of a God should be relegated to the ages of ignorance? Pursuing this principle, of declaring God unnecessary, the immortality of the soul is denied, and, since there is to be no hereafter, according to their way of thinking, there can be neither a heaven nor a hell, neither final reward nor punishment. It remains then to find ways and means for building a heaven in this world. This vagary, which socialism pursues as its task, brings forth a false standard of morality. Actions are no longer considered right or wrong in as much as they conform to, or are opposed to the will of God, but according as they benefit or harm the individual. The standard of morality has come to mean nothing else than: "What is there in it for me!" Honesty will be practised if an advantage can be gained by it. If a greater advantage is offered by dishonesty, and the chances of being discovered are slender, no harm is seen in being dishonest.

As God stands for order, law and harmony, the new pagan code of morals produces disorder, injustice and worldwide unrest. Extravagance goes side by side with direst want. The granaries of the world are full to overflow, we read of elaborate dinners given to monkeys, to pet dogs and cats, while thousands of human beings

go to bed hungry, and other thousands must beg for clothing and shelter.

In this age, then, of atheistical "ethics" we find Catholic manhood as isolated as was St. Joseph two thousand years ago in the land of the pagans. Our Catholic manhood will either be swallowed by this moloch of the twentieth century—which God forbid—or our Catholic manhood must exercise a superior force, and become a leaven to permeate the whole of mankind. This, in a nutshell, is the problem of our times. True it is, we have the consoling assurance of our dear Lord, that "the gates of hell will not prevail against the Church." To redeem His pledge, Christ will work miracles if necessary. But we must not forget that, as a rule, Divine Providence seeks natural means, rather than the miraculous, to accomplish its ends. Our dear Lord cannot permit the work of His Redemption, the Kingdom of God, to be destroyed. He will have recourse to miracles if natural means should fail. And which are the natural means that will keep up and perpetuate the Church of Christ? You, the Catholic manhood of this twentieth century, are the means upon which Divine Providence depends to accomplish its ends, which are the honor of God and the salvation of souls.

Complicated though the problems may appear to us, they are not so difficult as to cause us to hesitate in our efforts to work out their solution. Look up to the great St. Joseph whose heroic figure rises up over all these centuries. By studying his holy life and by following his example we cannot fail to bring order out of chaos.

In the conferences that are to follow we shall consider the various errors and needs of our times, shall endeavor to understand our public duties, and the duties of Catholic manhood towards

home and the family, and we shall show how admirably the life of St. Joseph fits into our very day and time.

Let us ask the help of good St. Joseph that we may learn to know him and love him more and more, and that by being made worthy to walk in his footsteps we may be enabled to labor successfully for the glory of God, and for the welfare of home and country.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CATHOLIC MANHOOD TOWARDS PUBLIC LIFE

II. The Waning of Faith

The waning of Faith in this twentieth century is a singular and lamentable phenomenon. It is *singular* because the increased culture and refinement in other matters should presuppose an equal advancement in matters religious, the more so since religion is the source and foundation of civilization, and the mother of true art and science; it is *lamentable* because as Faith grows weaker vice will grow stronger. The dangers that threaten society grow stronger as Faith becomes weaker.

People may acquire sufficient wisdom to fathom the mysteries of the deep and to read the secrets of the sky; yet when they fail to see God in the wonders of nature they are groping in the dark, notwithstanding all their skill.

Unfortunately, the decline of Faith is not limited to this country or another. The bitter warfare against God is waged throughout all the lands which centuries ago the Church wrested from barbarism. Indeed, the warfare against God is so pronounced in character, and so uniform in action, that it would seem to emanate from some well organized society, the ramifications of which have spread to the furthermost parts of the world.

In our fair land, it is true, the antagonism against God has not as yet shown itself in confiscatory enactments of laws, such as we witness so often in the countries of Europe. Our conditions differ from those of many of the Latin countries, where people are

either Catholics or atheists. Here there is a third class, composed of others who, though not of our Faith, still believe in God. Hence, the warfare against God in our fair land is still more or less disguised, although one can never doubt its effectiveness. Here the enemy of God cunningly calls upon Protestantism as an ally to help fight the "monstrous" Roman Church. Witness, for example, the blind zeal of many of our Protestant brethren who champion the cause of a disreputable paper like the *Menace,* who invite fake priests to address them in their churches and from the public platform. The sworn enemy of God knows full well that if but the Catholic Church can be crippled in her activity, it will be little trouble to brush aside the various Protestant sects, because they are constantly warring against each other.

If—which God forbid—the Faith of our Catholic manhood should decline, it will only be a question of days when the conditions of Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal will be ours to contend with. And what resistance would be offered in such a contingency? The many would be listless, indifferent, and the few would be unable to effect hardly more than a protest.

The enemy of God is most cunning in the undermining of Faith.

If all the slurs and malicious attacks against the Faith were gathered within the covers of some ponderous volume, few would there be to bother about reading it. But, since our superficial people delights in having its mental food administered in the shape of a problem novel, of a play or a comic opera, the enemy of God makes use of novel and stage, and of the soap-box orator, to poison the minds. Even honest Protestants ought to take a stand in opposition to such attacks against revealed Truth. But the greater part of our Protestant brethren are not even conscious of the situation. The Church, then, must fight God's battle single-handed.

To give a concrete example of the isolated position of the Church, in her warfare against infidelity, it will suffice to call attention to a play that was recently in much popular favor. The drift of the story and the tendency of the play was to render a laughing-stock of the indissolubility of the marriage bond. Divorce was hailed as the salvation of mankind, the key to universal happiness. To add spice and flavor to the plot, the villain was an Irish Catholic and a drunkard. His wife, as the featured heroine, tires of her burden and gets the notion to try her luck with another man. The parish priest, exhorting her to bear her burden, is understood to typify the Catholic Church and her attitude towards matrimony. The so-called heroine, leaving her drunken husband, and marrying another man, is to show that the rule of the Catholic Church is fast going to pieces, and that enlightenment, freedom and happiness will reign when the Church, the enemy of such enlightenment, freedom and happiness, is defeated.

Both atheists and Protestants have by their attendance and applause approved of the mockery to which the great Sacrament of Matrimony was reduced. Up to the present time the Catholic press has stood alone in voicing its protest against this caricature of truth. We have yet to hear of even one Protestant publication—otherwise so zealous for the word of God—that ever pointed in its pages to the words of God: "What God hath joined together let not man put asunder." These words, let it be well understood, still have the same binding force that they had when uttered by God, He who assures us that "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

When marital infidelity is made a joke, when scientists juggle with facts and figures to demonstrate that for the origin of life and matter no God was necessary, when the immortality of the soul

is laughed at as a nursery story, when our learned men attack the very Divinity of Christ, when quacks of all varieties pretend to have a cure for all the ills of our social and political body, then it is time for all decent people to stand by that Church which proclaims through the successor of St. Peter that there is no other salvation given to man under heaven than in the name of Jesus. The Catholic Church is the one voice crying in our wilderness of doubt and unbelief. The first voice in the wilderness that proclaimed Christ fell upon many a deaf ear. So does the voice of the Church in our desert of doubt and unbelief fall upon many a deaf ear. To add insult to injury, the efforts of the Catholic Church in proclaiming truth and combating error are interpreted to mean that the Church is hostile to intellectual research, that it is her policy to keep mankind in ignorance. And these attacks come from the very men who do their utmost to lead others to doubt and denial, who persistently strive to keep others in prejudice and ignorance about the truth.

Let us implore good St. Joseph to intercede with the Christ Child that our Faith may not fail us, and that our loyalty to God will have a wholesome effect upon those poor people whose Faith is wavering in these times of turmoil, of doubt and unbelief.

The Church has faced troublesome times before, and she has overcome even greater difficulty put in her way to stop her progress. She will meet and overcome the difficulties of this age. But it remains for the Catholic manhood of our age to be ever steadfast and loyal. Then, come what may, God will never forsake His own.

III. The Spreading of Atheism

A stone cast into a stagnant pool will form circle after circle upon the waters until the banks resist further spreading. So does our modern paganism, like a stone thrown into a pool, spread further and further, unless vigorously resisted. And just as the ever growing circles in the pool deface the picture of sun and sky in the water, so does our modern paganism mar that peace and tranquility in life that should be proper to the children of God.

We fondly imagine that we are a Christian nation, and we glory in that name. At the same time, however, more than half the population of this fine land of ours is not affiliated with any of the numerous denominations. While the Catholic Church is stronger than three or four of the most representative denominations taken together, for the simple reason that she is organized and her forces are united, one may safely say that nearly half of our population believe in no God. How useless, then, to boast of our great achievements when the land is desolate with the desolation of unbelief. Much has been done by the Church in the past. Much has been done despite the dreadful odds against the Church. Yet, we are only at the beginning of the real work, and great obstacles must be overcome to save that which was lost, and to restore all things in Christ.

In the heroic work of renewing the face of the earth, the Church is the salt of the earth. It cannot be otherwise, since only she was authorized and commissioned to spread the glad tidings of her Lord.

Looking about us, among our dissenting brethren, we can scarcely detect an indication of a reawakening of faith, although sporadic

efforts are not lacking here and there. For the greater part their professional reformers strain at gnats and swallow camels.

The aims of these self-appointed reformers must come to naught, partly because they follow the business of "reforming" for the money there is in it for them, and partly because by their diatribes they repel rather than attract. Many people outside of the True Fold are, like children, crying for the bread of the gospel truths, and there is none to give to them. In their churches they find moving-picture shows or some other entertainment, with some would-be reformer talking about all sorts of matter except the gospel. The gospel is out of fashion. And thus modern paganism is spread among our Protestant brethren. Nor does this poison of atheism confine itself to our dissenting brethren; it seeks to attack the lukewarm of our own creed. Yes, the lukewarm Catholics are often affected by this poison, and soon they drop out of the ranks altogether.

Little wonder, then, that atheism gains ground so easily in our fair land. If this were simply a religious question, some might say: What difference does it make? But the spreading of atheism in our country does not only affect religion and the souls of men, but the very foundation of our land. Indeed, our country cannot escape anarchy if the people at large become indifferent to the loss of Faith.

To point to only one thing which eventually must bring ruin upon this land, if the tide of paganism is not stemmed, just see how an oath is even now regarded. The oath is one of the most important matters in the administration of justice. Of what value, however, is an oath upon the lips of one who denies that there is a God. Another malady resulting from decline of Faith, a malady attacking the very foundation of our government, is public corruption.

And then there is the ever increasing ratio of juvenile criminals that has set great lawyers and educators a-thinking. No atheist, however, is willing to admit that the constant growth of juvenile crime must be attributed to the lack of moral education. The solutions and remedies some of these unbelieving experts propose are too ludicrous for mention. Not very long ago an expert educator advanced the theory that crime and corruption would pass away if the children had more public play grounds. Another prominent educator claimed that the influence of music would destroy the baser traits in the juvenile mind, and that therefore each school should have a pianola or at least a phonograph, that the pupils be regaled with selections from the great masters, in lieu of moral instruction. Evidently the teaching of the Ten Commandments of God is so much beneath the dignity of modern enlightenment that it does not deserve thought.

Whatever the name or guise of "ethical" culture, so called, may be, one fact will always prove an obstacle in the way of achieving any lasting results. And this is the inability of merely natural virtues coping successfully with human inclinations. Natural virtues are based upon a purely utilitarian principle, namely the seeking of self, and can never have the compelling force with which religion invests morality.

Relying upon Divine help, and enriched with the experience of centuries, the Catholic Church fully understands the drift of the times, she recognizes the cause of the evil that makes the land desolate, and she insists that a purely secular education, with all its high-sounding phrases of "ethical" culture, is not able to stem the tide of vice, and hence she wages war against our modern paganism single-handed, resting assured that her help will come from Him who hath made heaven and earth.

She, the custodian and teacher of revealed truth, sounds the warning cry, showing the world how the evils of the present day are traced to a lack of religion. But, alas, even many of her own children, by indifference and lukewarmness, or imagined intellectual superiority, turn a deaf ear to her motherly pleading.

Much is expected of you, the Catholic manhood of this day. The Church appeals to men, to you! Can you afford to see this country go to ruin? Can you afford to rob your children of peace and security in this life, and of happiness in the hereafter? Can you afford to lose for yourself the heritages, both temporal and eternal, for which your forefathers in the Faith gave their very lives? Can you afford to trample under foot the very honor of God?

Therefore, as much as in your power, help and try to stop the poison of modern paganism from doing more harm than it has already done.

Ask of the good St. Joseph that we, the Catholic manhood of this country, may obtain a spark of that zeal for the holy Faith that he showed amid all the dangers to which his stay in Egypt exposed him.

IV. The Social Question

When a number of people unite in denying the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, and future reward and punishment, they must then adapt themselves to conditions that result from the shaking off of the ideals of the old faith. For when people expect no heaven in the hereafter it is no more than logical for them to try to create for themselves a substitute on earth. Naturally, they feel that by shaking off the old ideals they deprive themselves of a definite hope. Something must be sought to take the place of that of which they deprive themselves. Hence the idea of making this earth a heaven gains ground in proportion as Socialism advances.

And so the soap-box orator of Socialism grows eloquent in picturing the beauties of the "future state" on earth. According to the vagaries of these orators there will be no longer misery or poverty on earth once Socialism will rule. Money, the root of all evil, will be abolished, there will be neither rich nor poor, all will be free and equal and happy. No longer will people suffer from grinding toil, there will be no mighty capitalists to crush the people, and earth will again be paradise.

To the unthinking, and to the class of "I won't work" people, these promises sound very alluring. Never a question is asked whether these promises, like a mirage, will ever remain up in the air, or whether they can ever be put into everyday practice. In the meantime cupidity and hatred are aroused, and their first object, the fomenting of distrust and discontent of the masses, is accomplished.

In our day, then, the problem of Socialism, the social problem, is *"the" question.* To close our eyes to this fact were folly. To

say there are no abuses in our present social makeup would be equally erroneous. We have to remedy abuses, and remedy them in a way that will conform to the ways of God and His holy Law. We must look facts in the face, and take them as they are, not as we might like them to be. Hence, the social question must be dealt with as it is, we must ascertain the facts.

No one with an ounce of common sense can say that social conditions are ideal at present. It is true that in many instances they are far better than ever in the past. That, however, does not imply that they may not and should not be improved upon. Laboring conditions were infinitely worse during the times of ancient paganism; for when even physicians and teachers were bought and sold as slaves, the lot of the poor and of the unskilled laborer must indeed have been deplorable. It was Christianity that brought about the abolition of slavery, not by fire and sword, not by upsetting social and political conditions in a general revolution, but by the Cross of Christ alone, which proclaimed to the world that God is the Father of all and that we are brethren one to another. If to-day the world looks for redress and help it will look in vain, and appeal in vain, unless it turns back to that Church and that teaching by which barbaric hordes were given their first civilization.

Time was, when England was called "Merry England." That was when England was still Catholic—before the so-called Reformation. At that time neither extreme riches nor extreme poverty were known. The poorest had enough to eat and to clothe themselves, and refuges for the poor as we now have them in every state were unnecessary. Before this Reformation both, the rich and the poor, were law-abiding, because they recognized the Laws of God of which the law of the State was an outward expression. With

an entire population abiding by the laws as a matter of conscience, better results were obtained than with a people without faith, who look upon the law as a matter of expediency. While the former keep the law for the sake of God, the Supreme Lawgiver, the latter simply see only a power whose law must be carried out only when there is danger of being caught in the violation of it. To facilitate the breaking of the laws of the State we see various influences at work, shielding the lawbreaker rather than supporting the administration of laws. It is no wonder, then, that, in the absence of faith corruption of all kinds must be rampant. Neither those who screen the lawbreaker, nor the violators of the law, seem to understand that they do not only betray the State, the lawfully constituted authority, but that they betray the law of God and the rights of man.

People may say, or do, what they like. They will never be able to invent a code of morals, or "ethics," to work out full justice to all men without paying due regard to the supreme law of God. True religion must ever be the basis of true morality, and the further people drift away from this true religion the more disordered will be the general conditions of the nation.

For this very reason Socialism will *never* be able to offer a correct solution for the ills and wrongs of the present time, because any argument based upon false principles must inevitably lead to false conclusions. Indeed, Socialism cannot point to a single successful demonstration of its scheme of remodelling the world. At various times and places socialistic colonies have been started, but in each case they had to disband, showing beyond a doubt that the cure was worse than the disease.

A great responsibility rests upon you, the Catholic manhood of this century. Pope Leo XIII., of blessed memory, has in his en-

cyclical on labor shown the way to remedy present wrongs; the hierarchy and the clergy have, by word of mouth and by the pen, stood for the cause of Christ, and it remains for you, each in your own way and sphere, to carry out their suggestions.

You must consider it a solemn duty to study this social question that you may grasp the meaning of it in all its many aspects. It will happen that people, carried away with the glittering promises of demagogues, will give you a wrong idea of the social question, you should be able to correct them by showing them the truth. If it will not convince them, at least they will leave you alone in future. Now and then a paper, a magazine or pamphlet, may come out with a thorough exposure of the socialistic fallacy. Many well-meaning Catholic men will look at the heading of that article, the name of the author, and possibly they read half a column of it. After reading that much they lay it aside and say: "Now Socialism is done for. That will settle the question." It will not! That article deserves more attention than the reading of its headline or of a few paragraphs. It should be read fully, not only once, but twice, three times, so that you may become acquainted with all the facts. Nor is this all that is expected of you. The principal object of the writer is that you should make use of his arguments whenever an opportunity presents itself. In having that article in your mind you will know the answers to the many objections made by the enemies of God.

Therefore, I say to you, men of this century, study this social problem. Study and digest it well. If you have the facts clearly in your mind they will enable you to refute the attacks made against God and country, and you yourselves will be the means of communicating to others a clear understanding of the truth about the social question.

V. The Chief Principles of Socialism

Oftentimes the question is asked whether a Catholic may be a Socialist, and when a negative answer is given, as in conscience it must be given, a tirade is flung at the Catholic Church for her presumption and tyranny in enslaving the minds and wills of men. We are told then and there that socialism has nothing to do with religion because it deals with questions that concern this life only. Socialism, so we are told, is nothing more nor less than a purely political party, having as its aim the bettering of laboring conditions, and that no friend of labor can afford to oppose it on these purely political issues. Whoever, then, dares to oppose socialism is at once decried as an enemy of labor, a spy, a slave of capital, and so on.

The trouble with socialists is that they only tell half a truth. It is true they claim that they have nothing to do with religion. They never say a single word in its favor. Thus far they leave religion severely alone. But they attack religion openly when they dare, and covertly and indirectly when they fear a loss of votes by an open attack. They claim that as a political party they help the working man. They help him—to his complete ruin and loss of freedom.

There must certainly be required a great deal of self-control and training for socialistic soap-box orators to make their assertions with a straight face. They must know they are not telling the whole truth when they say they have nothing to do with religion, and only work for the working man.

The Catholic Church has a reason when she forbids Catholic men

to join the ranks of socialists, and these reasons will become apparent when we consider the starting point of socialism.

In explaining its doctrine socialism denies the existence of God and the immortality of the soul of man. To clothe its system with high-sounding names that daze the unlearned, socialism draws upon the Darwinian theory as the explanation of all things, man included. We have, then, the theory of evolution as applying to the history of the world and of mankind. Time was when the word "evolution" was the pass-word that gave people a ready admission to circles of scholars, mostly infidels. Although the theory of evolution in the case of man has been discarded by most thinking men, it still serves the purpose of socialism with its high-sounding phrases, and, at the same time as a method of explaining the world and man in a way that makes God unnecessary as the first or creative Cause. According to socialism the whole world, man included, simply happened and evolved itself from some necessary force. Furthermore, this evolution of all things, man included, was not brought about by any guiding spirit like a Divine Providence. That would make a God necessary. According to them there was no such guiding force or spirit, but only a compelling, irresistible force of which mankind and the social conditions now prevailing are the necessary outcome.

Now, if man is only a product of evolution, of a blind force, that made him what he is, it must follow that man is not responsible for his actions. We can readily understand why such a system of thought must appeal to every violator of laws human and Divine. But if man must simply be what this evolution makes him, how can socialism change this blind force?

This contradiction cannot be met by saying that socialism always was part and parcel of this brute force; for if it were it would be responsible for all the ills of the past. As a matter of fact, socialism

claims not to be responsible for social and political ills of the past or present. The question, then, is: how can socialism claim with one breath that this evolution was not a success in the past and up to now, that this evolution will go on for ever, and with the next breath state that now is the time for socialism to step in and better the conditions!

From this you may observe that socialism does not proceed far before it begins to contradict itself. Nor can it be otherwise. Any system that leaves out God as the Creator and Supreme Law-giver must lead to wrong conclusions and become tangled up in a maze of contradictions.

Although socialists affirm that religion is a private matter, concerning the conscience of each man privately, the leading exponents of socialism, both here and abroad, are men who openly proclaim they believe in no God. Such blasphemous utterances as theirs, given in their books and speeches, can scarcely be looked upon as merely private opinions. And then we need only consider the vile sheet entitled "Menace" to learn how much socialism loves the Catholic religion, and whether it is eager to leave each man consider his religion as his own private affair.

And why is it that of the many religious denominations the Catholic Church is picked out before all the rest for the most venomous attacks? Because the Catholic Church stands forth as the power bold enough and strong enough to tell socialism: "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

If other denominations applaud and support any attack made against the Catholic Church, they fail to understand that any weakening of faith must ultimately be felt by them as well.

Why is it that socialism hates and fears the Catholic Church? It

is because that Church, and that Church only, has a weapon dangerous to it. And this weapon is the truth.

It is you, the Catholic manhood of our time, who must make the cause of your Church your cause. You have nothing to fear in wielding that weapon of truth for God and country.

VI. Can Socialism Claim to be One of Our Political Parties?

Whenever it is a question of catering to voters of staunch religious convictions, the claim is brought forth that socialism in this country has nothing whatever in common with the socialism of other countries; that the advanced ideas proclaimed by leading exponents of socialism in Europe do not apply to the conditions of our country, and that, so far as this country is concerned, socialism is nothing but a political party, having a platform like all other such parties, calling upon the voter to witness its ability and intention to meet the problems of the day, and to redeem the pledges which other parties are alleged to have broken.

Like most other political orators, the exponents of this plea are equal to the occasion and are able to make most extravagant promises with a straight face. Others less trained in the art of deception might blush or grin; not so the socialist orator. He brazenly tells the working-man that if the socialist ticket should win, each working-man would get a five-thousand-dollar salary, and so on.

In order to ascertain whether the socialist party has a right to pose as one of our political parties, let us first see what the spirit of party system is in our country.

Any country depending upon constitutional authority must have two or more parties for its own welfare. It matters little whether the government be a constitutional monarchy or a republic, like our own country, or whether the parties are called Conservative or Republican or Democratic; the end and aim of parties, regardless

of any name, must be the perpetuation and welfare of the country, the upholding of lawfully constituted authority.

Safe, sound and patriotic men may have their honest differences of opinions as to which of the parties will be best suited to secure the stability of the country, the upholding of lawful authority, and the welfare of the people. No matter what party will draw most votes, on the day of election the minority will abide by the decision of the voters, convinced that the stability and the welfare of the country will be taken care of. And if it should prove that the welfare of the country might be advanced in a better way by another party, it will only be a question of time when the other party will be given an opportunity to put into practise its better ideas. But in no way will a party dare to wilfully bring into danger the stability of the country. The moment one of the parties would attempt to undermine the stability of the authority invested in the legislative, executive or administrative branch of the government, that party would be doomed.

Of late years socialism has entered the political field as a political party, soliciting votes under the plea that it stands for the welfare of the working-man, that it wants to better the conditions of the laboring class, and so on.

But let us see what right socialism has of entering our political arena, to be a part of our lawfully constituted authority.

Is it pledged to work for the stability and the welfare of the commonwealth as this is understood and constituted now?

We have *no* pledge of any kind. Its platform is constructed to mislead men who will not think. Socialism is neither American, nor German, nor English—it is international in its scope and in its organization. Its members care no more for the United States, for England, Germany, France, or any other country than we care for

the man in the moon. Socialism is opposed to any and all lawfully constituted governments, be they monarchical or republican. Everywhere its avowed aim is to get control of the government by votes, if that is possible, or by bullets, if that be the only other way, and to uproot that government. To destroy a constitutional government, and place its own socialistic government in its stead, is the outspoken plan. One will look in vain for patriotism in the ranks of socialists. They care no more for the Stars and Stripes of our fair land than they care for the flag of France or of any other country. Their flag is the red flag. All others are hated rags in their sight. In the civilized world red has come to be a signal of danger, and it were well for the sake of self-preservation that the people of our land would become aware of the fact that there can be but one flag in this country. Nor does it require a prophet to foresee the time approaching when the various parties of our fair land will have to lay aside their party differences and combine forces for the sake of God and country. The question for us to decide will be, whether we desire to have the Stars and Stripes floating over our heads, as a pledge of stability and welfare, or whether we shall permit the red flag of socialism to end our liberty.

Really, how can a socialist aspire to political office, to which, if he is elected, he must come with perjury and treason in his heart! Before entering upon an office the aspirant must swear to uphold the Constitution. The socialist knows, and the people at large should know, that he has no more idea of upholding the lawfully constituted authority of this land than he has of supporting the English or German crown. He has no more idea of working for the stability and welfare of this land than he has of maintaining the authority of the Sultan of Turkey. His one aim is to undermine all lawfully constituted authority, and thus to bring its downfall so

much nearer. Indeed, such is the strength of this international organization that members elected to political office are only the puppets in the hands of those higher up in the organization. The organization demands a written resignation of its members accepting public office, to take immediate effect the moment they show that they would rather obey their conscience than their socialistic bosses.

If American socialists were sincere in their plea to be a political party, they should by all means resign from this international union, of which now they are part and parcel, and make good their assertion of being only a party like the others, having as their end and aim the stability and the welfare of this particular country.

Once in a while there is a howl going up when a Catholic dares to aspire to office, if even only of constable. If a Catholic is elected to such an office, how long will it take till the Pope will come to America, and then disaster! But a socialist can aspire to the highest office of the land, and no fear whatsoever is felt for the stability of the country!

Socialism, a political party for the betterment of the working people! What has it ever done for the working man? Has it ever done anything to gain the confidence of the people? Germany, at the present time, has probably the best laws meeting the needs of labor. No one fought against these enactments so bitterly as the socialists, who prate so much about bettering the conditions of labor. Is there a wealthy socialist who is absolutely fair and honest with the workers he employs? According to the papers a certain millionaire socialist had such wretched conditions in his factory that his workers went on strike. While this same man went around proclaiming how socialism was to help the working man in his struggles for a living wage, his own workers received starvation wages. And there are other cases just like this one.

Whenever socialists tried to organize colonies, to show the working plan of their scheme, they soon had to declare them utter failures. And such efforts have not been wanting, both here, in South America, and in Europe, to show the world a beautiful model of the *future state*. Not a single one of these colonies succeeded. And these are the men who claim to know how to benefit the working man!

It behooves you, the Catholic manhood of our time, to open your eyes to the true situation. And not only that; you must try to open the eyes of those who, for some reason or other, are unconscious of the drift of the times.

As a matter of fact, the socialist party stands for nothing but treason against the country and revolt against God. Look to St. Joseph, the model of working-men of his time, and ask yourselves whether he would remain indifferent in the face of the blasphemy and treason signified in that red flag, and the answer to this question should be your guide in your own position toward this evil of our times.

VII. Fallacies of Sosialism

I. Labor Produces All Wealth?

In our previous conference you have learned why a man can not be a socialist and at the same time a good Catholic. Our dear Lord tells us: "No man can serve two masters." How, indeed, could any one be a Catholic and accept the doctrines of socialism, denying, as they do, the very existence of God? A socialist, to be sincere, must accept the teachings and doctrines laid down by his leaders. These doctrines, however, deny the existence of God. They scout the ideas of a future life, of the immortality of the soul and future reward and punishment as laid down in the teachings of Christ.

We may even go a step further and say that no man, whether Protestant, Jew or infidel, if he has any common sense, can be a socialist, because the whole system of socialism is a maze of contradictions, and such a system can never contain or further the truth, or for that matter the welfare of men.

In this and the following conferences we will examine a number of the principles of socialism. To-day let us examine their claim that *labor produces all wealth.*

This claim is reiterated so persistently and in so many variations, and the true facts and figures are juggled so cleverly, that people are too often carried away with the force of these words, especially that class of people who will not think, who will close their eyes to facts, in the fond hope of stumbling at last into a fairyland where every day will be a Sunday, and every man a king.

Let us ask, now, whether labor really produces all wealth.

The man working at a machine, the man setting ties for a railway at so much per day, the miner digging coal or ore from the bowels of the earth, each is told by the socialist how he is the creator of wealth for an employer who does no work at all. The laborer gets only a scant wage which does not permit him to have any of the luxuries which wealth can enjoy, and socialists will tell the laborer: "Look at the work you do, look at the wages you get, they are not enough for you to enjoy your life as your employer enjoys his; you hardly get enough to live! And then look at your employer! See how he rolls in wealth! He hardly knows what to do with it. Who has made him rich? It was you, you, you! Your labor made him rich. Is it not a fact that labor produces all wealth? The socialist orators grow very eloquent in painting the ease and comfort of the employer in his comfortable office, and they ask whether the laboring man has an electric fan to keep him cool in summer, whether he can sit in a fancy revolving chair during his work, whether he has a mansion to live in, and a cottage at the seashore for the summer? All of which, of course, the laboring man has not. Such specious arguments help to give this false principle a semblance of truth, and they foment hatred and envy of the masses. And these orators will feel themselves amply repaid if they can gain their purpose, which is the sowing of discontent.

To give such arguments even more force statistics will be made to order, to show that the laboring man is cheated of the difference between the wages he receives and the selling price of the article he produces.

The amount a laborer gets for making a pair of shoes is compared with the price of shoes sold at the store. The difference, it is claimed, belongs not to the employer, but to the laborer who

made the shoes. Who gets the difference? the socialist will ask. The boss, of course! Labor produces everything, the boss nothing. Yet labor gets only a few pennies and the boss grows wealthy. Again we hear: Labor produces all wealth.

Let us investigate this claim. If it were not for the word "all" the claim would contain some truth, like a number of other socialistic assertions. As it stands, however, it is false. The fallacy of the proposition must be all the more apparent, since by labor only manual labor is meant. Socialists are wise in their generation by crediting to manual labor the creation of all wealth, because they know what part of humanity can most easily be won over to their schemes. It is true, socialism claims a number of wealthy people in its ranks. But we have yet to learn of one who disposed of his wealth for the benefit of the working man. They are socialists for revenue only. It is equally true that the majority of the laboring class is law abiding and honorable. The thinking men of this class will look upon socialism with suspicion. All others, however, are an easy prey. They readily throw reasoning to the winds. Some people simply wait for a man to come and sell them a gold brick.

Let us suppose now that you own a number of acres of woodland. Some of the trees are elms and tamaracks, while others are oaks and maples. The actual cost of cutting the trees and hauling them to the mill is the same for both, the cheap and the expensive grade of lumber. If, then, labor would produce *all* wealth, the selling price would be the same for one tree as for another. The fact is, however, that the market pays more for hard wood than for ordinary wood. This is just an instance to show that manual labor does not produce *all* wealth. One source of wealth, therefore, is found in the raw material, independent of labor.

The elm is a common tree. Its wood is not adapted for fine work, hence hard maple, walnut or oak are needed for such work, and consequently hard wood fetches better prices. The mining of gold and silver will be practically alike in cost of labor. Yet who will say that both metals should be of the same value? Labor, then, does not produce *all* wealth.

The market price of raw material, but also the law of demand and supply, are factors in the production of wealth the same as labor. Another example may bring out this point even more clearly. Air is absolutely necessary for all life. There can be neither plant life nor animal life without air. There is a universal consumption of air. But why is never a price set on air? Simply for the reason that, though the demand is great, the supply is greater and inexhaustible. Let me give you still another example. Go to a toy store and the merchant may show you boxes of toys that he did not sell during the holiday season for the simple reason that there was no demand for this kind of toys. There was the supply, but no demand. His entire stock may be a loss to him. He would sell it even below cost, but no one wants it. Here we have a case of supply without demand.

You might go to a book store and look at two particular books. One has a splendid sale, while the other remains on the shelves. Let us suppose that the two books have cost the same amount to produce them. Why is it that one book will have a tremendous sale, while the other is ignored? If it were only a question of manual labor both should sell alike. But they do not. What, then, is it that creates a demand for the one book, while no one wants the other?

The one book is ably written, it appeals to people, it becomes the talk of the newspapers and magazines, and the demand for it

grows with each day. In some way or other the second book remains on the shelves of book stores. Now, if manual labor did produce *all* wealth, that other book should have an equal share of popularity, equal profit for publisher, author and bookseller. So there is something besides manual labor that produces wealth. This is a third source of wealth, besides labor, and that is thought.

There is yet another factor for producing wealth, and that is capital.

While labor is necessary for capital, capital is vitally necessary for labor. An example will illustrate this point. Consider the building of a railway. A company of wealthy men combine to build a railway through a certain section of land. Have you ever considered how many hundreds of thousands of dollars must be spent before that company can receive the first cent in return? There is the right of way that must be bought. A small army of lawyers and real estate men must be employed, and paid for, before the first spike is driven into the first tie. Surveyors are sent out and civil engineers, to map out the route of the tracks. Bridges must be built over rivers and valleys, tunnels must be dug through hills and mountains, the track must be graded, and when an army of workmen have done all that work, another starts to lay ties and rails. All this labor must be paid for, all material must be bought and paid for, and finally there is needed a lot of expensive equipment for freight and passenger service, repair shops, depots, and the thousand and one things required for the running of a train. For years thousands of people find steady employment and receive wages every week from capital which all these years does not earn a single cent, until finally the first passengers and the first load of freight are sent over the rails.

We have found, therefore, five factors productive of wealth.

The first is manual labor, the second the intrinsic value of material, the third the law of supply and demand, the fourth intellectual effort, and the fifth capital. Of all five taken together we can truthfully say that they produce all wealth. If, with labor, we include these other factors, the proposition is correct. Socialists, however, will never admit that these other factors are necessary and important.

We must not forget that even the laboring man receives a share of wealth. Labor produces wealth not only for the capitalist, but also for the working man. Any laboring man who gives proof of his thrift and enterprise, who becomes an expert in his line of work will get ample reward for his work, as the example of thousands of *self-made men* in our country testify. It is not that what a man earns that will make him wealthy, it is that what he will save. The man who earns a hundred dollars a month and spends a hundred will remain poor if he works a hundred years.

Yet socialists will forever proclaim that labor enriches only the wealthy, and statistics are made to order to give force to this argument.

Their favorite example is the instance of a laboring man in a shoe factory, figuring out what he gets for making a pair of shoes and what he must pay for a pair if he goes to buy them. The question, then, is asked: "Who gets the difference?" And the answer is: "The employer."

But let us see how many parties share in this difference of price. There must be considered all the office help of the factory, building and maintenance of the factory, insurance, interest on loans, taxes, the farmer who raises the cattle from which the hide is taken, the tanner who makes the hide into leather, the shipper, the salesman who sells the leather, the machinery used to work the

leather into shape, and finally the retailer who must make a profit in the selling of shoes; all these must be considered. It will be readily seen that the employer does not get all the difference, but just enough to pay expenses and a fair return on his investment and for his risk.

This claim of socialism is therefore false, and any man with common sense and not afraid to use his reason must see that it is false. It can only appeal to such as are wilfully blind to facts and purposely deaf to reason. It appeals strongly to the discontented, and these do not always ask whether the reason for their discontent is not of their own making.

VIII. Fallacies of Socialism

II. Property

Standing upon the wrong principle that labor creates all wealth, socialism next attacks the idea of property, again avoiding the truth, and again contradicting itself. Socialism, in fact, is consistent only in inconsistency.

According to socialistic reasoning, all evils of the present day are traceable to property. Property makes for inequality, since one man has more property than another. It is the assertion of property rights that makes the poor poorer and the rich richer. In fact, it knows of but one way of abolishing poverty and that is to do away with personal property. The more skillful and fortunate must be prevented from getting more property at the expense of the less skillful and fortunate. Hence all property is to be abolished. Instead of personal property we are to have property in common, investing all right to property in "the state" and giving all persons an equal share in the use of the property.

In the foregoing conference we have seen how socialism claims that labor produces all wealth, and that capital takes the greater share of it, thus unjustly and dishonestly depriving labor of its full fruits. And thus we find socialism claiming in the same breath that there should be no property and yet the laborer is to get the full value for his work.

From this one should conclude that even in the socialistic state the laborer is to receive something besides a meal ticket, and then there would again be an unequal division of wealth, since laborers are not alike in capability, thrift, and enterprise.

Socialists have advanced various theories to show that the holding

of private property was not the original state of things. They try to show that only in the course of time men acquired property by force. But, as far back as reliable history goes, we read not only of the acquiring and maintaining of personal and private property, but of laws enacted to govern its acquisition and protection against unlawful claims.

If, for sake of argument, we hold that in the beginning all property was held by all in common, how could it ever happen that the few could rob so many? Such a theft would have brought about a revolution, even granting the physical possibilty. But nowhere in history do we read of any such assault upon common property.

In the remotest ages, known by reliable account, private property was held to be a natural right of man. No one was ever known to question it. In fact, wherever we find a trace of civilization, there we find also laws approving and governing the acquisition of property. The laws of ancient Peru dealt very severely with theft. Regardless of all contrary theories private property is a fact as old as the proverbial hills.

Man, in the first place, has a right to self-preservation. For his self-preservation he must have private property. If there were no such right how could he lawfully prevent another taking what he needs for his preservation. If Smith could go to Brown and take whatever he liked what would happen to our entire civilization? The world would be a chaos, where only might would be right. Man must necessarily claim and maintain that what he needs for the preservation of his life. Nor is that enough. If that were all, it would follow that all men must be and remain beggars, living from hand to mouth. Man has, furthermore, a right to labor, and he is entitled to keep what he earns. It is the ambition of each decent man to work in such a way as to perfect himself in his work,

and he will put forth his best efforts so that he will not only supply his present wants but to lay something aside for the times of sickness and for old age. And if he is a man of family and faithful to his responsibilities, he will seek to provide for his children that they may have a good start in life. All these things any man of normal inteligence and thrift will do instinctively, as a bird builds its nest.

Socialists delight in calling the wage earners "wage slaves," with the purpose of fomenting dissatisfaction and violence among certain classes of workers. But let me ask you, where do you find the real slaves? Are they found among the thrifty workers, who either own their own homes or who save their money to own such in the course of time, or will the slaves be found in that much praised state of socialism where workers will get nothing but a meal ticket and occasionally an order for a new suit of clothes, where even the word "home" will have no meaning?

Have you ever thought what it is that gives to man the incentive to work? While all labor in itself is a constant grind, some kinds of labor bring with them even the impairment of health and dangers to limb and life.

What is it then that urges man to do even work that life insurance companies classify as "unsafe risks." Surely, it is not the pleasure of doing this work. Yet hardly does one man succumb but there are others anxious to take up this work. Would they take up this hazardous work, especially if it requires skilled labor, if it did not usually call for more salary than work in which the risk of life does not figure. Wages, however, represent property, and man instinctively looks for that kind of work which will bring him the greatest amount of compensation, or property.

Remove this opportunity of acquiring property and what induce-

ment have you to offer a man to do the work in the pursuit of which he is sure to risk his life? Who would be willing to spend years and years in profitless effort in order to give to the world a great invention, if there were not the hope of finally reaping the rewards of that invention? Where would be the ambition and enterprise that now move the wheels of commerce, if all the reward a man could ever get for his work were a suit of clothes and a meal ticket? Where would willing hands be found to do hard and disagreeable work, when all the reward he would get would be no more than the pay obtainable for easy work? Here, as in all other instances, socialism has nothing to offer but smooth phrases and empty promises.

Catholics are told by socialists that property held in common should not be regarded unreasonable or impracticable, since the Holy Bible tells us that in the times of the Apostles the faithful held all property in common. If it was possible then, they ask, why not now?

We must bear in mind that these early Christians differed from socialists in giving *of their own* to help those in want. The whole drift of socialism, however, is to get the *property of the other fellow.* The early Christians gave what they had to the Apostles that they might help those who were in want. If socialists would follow the example of these early Christians one might at least recommend their good will.

When the Church then began to grow this charity system was no longer practical, and charity took another form. Asylums were established for the sick and the orphans, for the aged and the poor, and this system has prevailed to the present day.

Socialists also point to our many convents and monasteries, representing great money value, and in these convents and monasteries

they find men or women joined together working under a system of common property. Yes, it is true; we find many men and women in the various institutions of the Church, working diligently in their various professions, though all they can ever expect to get for their reward is their food,—and the food is plain,—and their clothing,—which is even plainer.

Here, socialists tell us, you find a perfect working model of what socialism intends to do for all mankind!

What urges a young girl to give up all the lawful pleasures of society, her pleasant home, the prospects of a happy life in a family of her own? Not the quality or style of the dress she is to take, not the kind of food that awaits her, not the monotonous life she will lead. It is something else, that urges her on to take upon herself this solitary life, and that is her love of God, and the desire she has of helping to save souls. What induces a young man to lay aside all ambition, to forsake all honors the world can give, to renounce all lawful pleasures? His only prompting is the love of God, and the wish to give his life for the saving of souls.

Imagine any of the wealthy socialists giving all their money to the poor, and going from one end of the country to the other as beggars preaching the message of good-will to all men, instead of hatred against all men, and depending upon charity for their simple meals.

There is but one motive that will prompt man to leave all and follow Christ, and that is not the charm of common property, for it has no charm. The only motive that will enable him to overcome all obstacles and difficulties and hardships, which poverty, obedience and chastity demand, is the love of God and nothing else.

From whatever angle we may look at the question of property,

it must be evident that its gaining and keeping is based upon natural law, upon natural conditions.

For people who openly profess that they have no faith in God the Ten Commandments have no meaning. For us, however, it is of importance to bear in mind the seventh and tenth commandment, viz.: "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's good." If all mankind would consciously practice these two commandments there would be no social question.

IX. Fallacies of Socialism

III. Equality

To gain the ear of the unthinking, of the malcontent and of men whose life spells failure, socialism will proclaim with great eloquence and fervor that *all men are equal.*

Here again we have a half truth which is employed to give a seeming reasonableness to many false deductions.

The principle that *all men are equal* is true in the following meaning: All men are equal in the sight of God. We are children of the same heavenly Father, whether our skin be white, black, yellow or brown. We all, regardless of creed or color, bear the same likeness of God in our immortal souls. We are, furthermore, equal before God in the requirements of His holy laws, the Ten Commandments. The emperor of the largest country of the world and his lowliest subject are equally held to obey the laws of God. Neither riches nor rank, neither merit nor learning, could ever be employed as a pretext for evading a single law of God. In this sense, then, we can say that, before God, all men are equal. Socialists, however, denying the existence of God, cannot agree to this true meaning of the principle. We may apply this principle in another way and keep within its true sense. All men are equal also before the law of the land. The justice of the law demands that all men should be on an equal footing before it. Rich as well as poor are equally bound to keep the law of the land. A rich man who breaks the laws must be brought to court the same as the poorest of the poor guilty of breaking the law. Justice demands that

neither pull, nor wealth, nor the position one holds in life, should ever exempt any one from obedience to the law of the land. Finally, all men are equal in another sense. All men are equal in the land so far as opportunities are concerned. Each man, whether of high or low birth, rich or poor, has equal opportunities with the next man for the pursuit of happiness. We need not go to history to find the names of great men who were the sons of poor parents. It is enough for you to recall the friends of your boyhood days. Many of them had the same start, with nothing, and yet some of them grew up to become men of wealth. They made use of opportunities that others who also had them failed to seize. Then, too, look at children of wealthy parents. Some, as they grew up, kept their fortunes and added to them; others had the same start and failed to even hold what they had. In our country we can safely say that opportunities are equal for all without distinction. Some make use of them, others do not, and that very fact shows where equality ends and inequality begins.

In the meanings just mentioned it is true that all men are equal. Unfortunately, however, socialism does not propound the principle in these true meanings. Contrary to all reason, socialism affirms absolutely that all men are equal, and therefrom it deduces that all men should share and share alike. Whether a man be a day laborer without either thrift or ambition, or the man who by arduous study invented the wireless telephone would make no difference. All men have, according to socialism, a like or equal claim upon all the good things of the world.

Such words are sweet music to the ears of those who long for possessions but who abhor effort. The man, too lazy to work, the drunkard who sends his earnings down his throat, the spendthrift who wantonly spends other people's money, the shiftless man who

weakly tries all work and succeeds at none, they hail this principle of socialism as the key that will open for them the granaries of the world, that will obtain for them admission to the comforts of life for which their craving is far greater than is their worth or fitness.

If socialism had the redeeming feature of being honest, one might say: I will grant you for the sake of argument that all men are equal; but just what is it that men are to share and share alike? It cannot be private property, for according to its philosophy private property is tabooed. It cannot be money, for that, too, is the root of all evil, the cause of poverty. Money will have no place in the socialistic state. What, then, are people to share and share alike, according to this principle of equality? It cannot be honors, because honors imply inequality and merit.

As in all its teachings, socialism is ever ready to make promises hide behind words and phrases that have a double meaning, half a truth and half an error. In its last resort socialistic equality would mean that every man, no matter what his occupation might be, whether civil engineer or driver of a delivery wagon, should share and share alike in the permission to live and to eat and to clothe himself.

Now let us consider this proposition, as socialists wish it understood, and see whether, man for man, there is such an equality.

Our histories date back to the oldest kingdoms of the world. They tell us what forces brought about their rise to great splendor, and what led to their downfall. They mention the names of great kings, able leaders of people, brave generals, men of peace, poets and artists. The very fact that histories point out the names of great men, shows that, as far back as history goes, there was no equality among men. The fact that history mentions kings goes

to show that there must have been subjects of that king who looked up to him as to their lord. The mention of generals leads us to infer that they must have had armies who followed them. Indeed, throughout the whole range of ancient history we can not find a single trace of a time when equality reigned. Moreover, history does not simply content itself with mentioning names of a few great ones of the earth, but describes many of the conditions of life. It tells us of ancient customs, ancient laws, modes of living, of dress and manners. Now, if there ever was equality in the beginning, as socialism claims there was, the change to inequality could never have been accomplished without great strife. Could we suppose for a moment that a great change could take place in the world upsetting the entire order of things without one single mention of it in history? When even the change of governments brought with it wars and bloodshed in the smallest of countries, would not the overturning of the entire social order from equality to inequality cause a war far more formidable than the mere change of dynasty? Can it be possible that history would hush up the biggest upheaval of mankind, when it wrote epics in honor of conquering kings?

History not giving even a hint of a prior state of equality, we must take it for granted that it never existed.

Again, where in all the wide world do we see anything like equality! You may look at thousands of trees of one variety, and not two of them will have the same formation of trunk, of limbs or branches. You may compare the leaves on one tree and you will not find two leaves exactly alike in every respect. In the sky above us star differs from star in splendor. We might compare rivers, lakes, mountains, valleys and hills, and we shall not find two exactly alike. Advancing higher in the order of creation, up through

the animal kingdom, we shall not find two animals exactly alike. Behold the crown of creation—man. You will not find in all the millions and millions of men even two who are exactly alike in strength of mind, in body, in looks, or in disposition. Sometimes we take note of a great similarity in twins or of so-called "doubles." Yet even in these exceptional cases there will never be found a really perfect likeness or equality. While they may resemble one another outwardly to a considerable extent, each has some peculiarity and trait which the other has not. Take any one man and you will discover that within himself there is a lack of equality. One eye is keener than the other, one ear hears better than the other, one arm may be stronger than the other. One side of his face may differ from the other. Where, then, in nature is there really equality? Nowhere!

Trace mankind back to the earliest ages and you will find inequality. We shall find one man a better hunter than another, one man a better builder than another, one a better tamer of animals than another. One was more skilful in fishing than another, one more successful in sale and barter, one more economical than another, one better in making bows and arrows than another.

What is the inevitable result of such a condition of things?

It is only natural to suppose that he who was the more successful in his work reaped the greater amount of reward. According to the standard of his time, whether values consisted in shells or hides, he would grow rich. And he would grow rich not indeed because he cheated others out of theirs, but because he put his own best efforts into his work. If others did not do as well as he, the fault could certainly not be attributed to him. The opportunities were alike for all. At the present time, of all the money in the world the average amount per capita is $31.11. Suppose that each

man, woman and child, received that amount as his or her share this very day. Would that abolish poverty? In less than a year we should find that while some made good use of their share, others wasted their and remained poor. And where would their share go? Evidently into the possession of the more thrifty.

From these observations it must be plainly seen, taking human nature as it is, that equality can never have existed in the past, that it does not exist now, and that it can never exist at any time in the future.

X. Socialism, the Enemy of Religion

It can not require much of an argument to convince thinking people that socialism is opposed to religion. The very system upon which it bases its claim is taken from ancient and modern paganism. While socialists differ in detail or method, they all agree upon what they call the "scientific" basis of their great system. This basis is evolution. And evolution is made by them to mean so much that God is nowhere needed in their system.

Matter evolved itself, plants evolved themselves, animals evolved themselves, man evolved himself. Hence, where is there need of a supernatural God if natural *force* rules supreme?

Considering evolution, we find that socialists utter here again a half truth, and from a perverted conception they deduce utterly false conclusions. Evolution? There is *some* evolution in all things, a gradual process from a less perfect state or condition to one more perfect than the preceding. An example will elucidate this point. Let us consider the process of evolution of our modern ocean steamers from the primitive dug-out of the early savage. Time was when the simple boat fashioned from the trunk of a tree was a triumph of skill. In course of time a sail was added to the boat, and the force of the wind made propulsion possible without the help of oars. That was another step in evolution! In course of time the ancient Greeks and Romans thought they had solved the problem of navigation with their elaborate boats. Again a step in evolution. Then were built ships such as those in which Columbus braved the unknown seas. This type of boat stood in its time for the highest type of water craft. Yet how few of us would care to risk their

lives to-day in such tiny shells? Then came the fourmasted ships, boats four times the size of the caravels of Columbus. Even they are considered inferior in the present age, and the latest type is the modern floating palace, such as the Imperator. Will evolution end here? Very likely not. As our designers of boats have incessantly learned from past experiences, as they steadily improved upon craft of former types, so we may safely expect that future designers will see mistakes in what we now consider a most perfect type of boat. There has been and is at work what we may rightly call evolution. Socialists will at once say: "Are we not right in saying that evolution is found in all things?" We will admit this much. But here is where we stop. The first boat, imperfect though it was, was a boat nevertheless. It was not a fan or a stove, but a boat. The very first hammer ever made was possibly nothing more than a stone fastened to a stick of wood; and, though it differed in looks widely from the modern sort of hammer, it was a hammer nevertheless, and not a darning needle or a shoe.

Hence, while observation teaches us that there is such a thing as evolution, we must bear in mind two things: In the first place, evolution never goes beyond its own species, and, secondly, it is never inherent, but always depending upon an outside force giving it the proper direction. The wildest fancy could never produce a series of moving pictures that would show the evolution of a carrier pigeon into a cat.

Could any sane man be found who would be willing to say honestly that the first boat, or the first hammer, made itself, and that they evolved themselves of their own inherent force into the beings we find these things to-day?

Yet this is exactly the kind of evolution by which, socialism tells us, the whole world was made. Everything we see, socialists tell

us, is the result of evolution. A force inherent within the being works out this process irresistibly. Everything, man included, is thus evolved. Force and matter, socialists say, are the cause and explanation of all things.

Way back in the remote ages, millions of years ago if you will, there must have been a starting point when matter and force began. There must have been a beginning sometime and somewhere, because matter and force could not make themselves. For if they did they would not be perishable. What, then, was first, matter or force? If matter was first, how could an inherent force ever get into matter at all? There must have been a time when it was not inherent. If force was first, how and where did it exist? How could it enter into dead matter?

If we must admit a beginning of things, we must likewise admit the existence of a God who set the time for this beginning, else how could the beginning be produced? Here, as in every other matter, socialism is only consistent in its inconsistency. On the one hand it claims that there is no God, even going so far as to say that the idea of a God arose from the superstitious fear and ignorance of savage people who invented superhuman beings as an explanation of phenomena they could not account for, but which science of later years is said to have demonstrated and explained satisfactorily without referring to God. A pagan of the remote past would hide at the roar of thunder and call it the voice of a god; but we of this age know the nature of thunder, and pity the ignorance and superstition of the poor savage! Thus, socialism tells us, the idea of God originated! Hence in reality there can be no such being at all, since it existed only in the minds of people. Yet, on the other hand, this same socialism tells us that if somebody would rather believe in God he may do so and still be a good socialist!

Of course, when election time comes around one will often hear that socialism is only a question of economics, and as such leaves religion severely alone. Religion, it is claimed, is a private matter, each one being supposed to do his own thinking in this matter. Unfortunately, however, such talk is used only at election time. Socialists by no means confine their activities to economic problems. Theirs is, indeed, the new religion, if such a dignified title can at all be given to this modern paganism.

Their leaders, without a single exception, are all avowed infidels, and they are by no means hesitating about giving voice to their anti-religious sentiments. Not only do they openly boast about their infidelity, but they let no opportunity go by without insulting the religious convictions of those who still believe in God. It is their outspoken purpose to destroy religion in the hearts of the people. And then they have the impudence to make a bid for votes by proclaiming, as one of the tenets of socialism, that religion is the private affair of each individual!

One can not pick up a single one of their publications without finding slur after slur against God and religion. Needless to say, the Catholic Church always gets the biggest share of all this abuse.

Often, especially before elections, when a socialist orator is confronted with rabid statements of socialistic writers, we are told that such statements must be taken as the private opinions of such writers, for which the entire party should not be held responsible. Then follows invariably an eloquent plea for freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of conscience.

Is it proper freedom of speech for a man to stand at a street-corner and incite the people to rebel against the government of our country? If a paper foments sedition and treason against the laws of the land, should it be allowed to hide behind the plea of freedom

of the press? Is a man allowed to insult the religious feeling of millions of people under the plea of freedom of conscience? What these people want is not liberty, but lawlessness.

The fact is that socialists craftily adjust their talk to the taste and views of the person they would like to win over to their purpose, even if only for the time being. Thus, while ordinarily avowing certain pernicious doctrines as principles of socialism, these same doctrines are disavowed and styled "private opinions," if that better suits the purpose in a given case.

Socialism is the enemy of all religion. It is nothing more than modern paganism. For that reason you men in this age must beware of the man who will tell you that socialism has nothing to do with religion, or does not interfere with religion. Do not believe that man, for he is purposely trying to mislead you, or else he is a dupe.

If any one wants to know what part religion will play in the future socialistic state, one has but to read the books of socialists who make public their dreams about how things will be run, when all the people are socialists and the new era, the earthly heaven, has dawned upon mankind. The details have all been worked out as to the conditions that will prevail in those blissful days, but not a word is ever mentioned about churches. In the socialistic state there will be no churches.

Suffice it to say that every socialist speaking with authority, both here and abroad, is so outspoken about the religious views of socialism that it is useless to explain them otherwise than they appear in cold type.

Principles as blasphemous and destructive as those of socialism could never gain foothold in this or any other country if faith were strong in the hearts of the people. Let us pray earnestly to good

St. Joseph, the model of a living faith, that our faith may never falter, and that by our example we may be enabled to strengthen the faith of others, so that pernicious and godless teachings may not lead them into fatal error.

XI. Socialism, the Enemy of Our Country

The principles advanced by socialists are so utterly opposed to the lawfully constituted government of our day that they could never be fully put into working order without first abolishing this government. It would mean, in fact, the abolition of all lawful authority, the abandonment of law and order. The result would be anarchy, chaos, the end of civilization, a reign of terror, such as witnessed in the French revolution.

In the monarchies and empires of the Old World socialists do their work hidden from view, like moles, since an open attack on government would be dangerous. They claim that a monarchy does not give to the people the full expression of their will which should be theirs in the making and enforcing of laws. They claim that kings and emperors exert force upon the people's representatives in the legislative bodies, and that thus not the will of the people but the will of the sovereign is law. Hence in all monarchies socialists are avowed republicans, eager for ways and means to overthrow the existing kingdom or empire in favor of a republic in which the will of the people would be supreme. Bebel at one time said: "Economically, I am a socialist, morally, an atheist, and politically, a Republican."

Since socialists are elsewhere so eagerly advocating the republican form of government one should think that in a republic they would feel happy and at home. Yet we find the socialists of France endeavoring to undermine the authority of the French Republic. Why is it that the will of the people of France, as expressed in their popular elections, does not please the socialists? Then, after

all, it is not a republican form of government socialism wants, but the abolition of government. And why should all law and order cease? For no other reason than to license plunder and pillage. Call to mind the bloody outrages of the French revolution. What security was there for even the poorest man who wanted to remain honest! None whatever. It meant free sway for the thief, the hoodlum, the thug, the vicious. Persons loyal to their God and duty had to go in hiding or leave the country if they wished to keep their heads on their shoulders. Here is your socialist freedom. Look at the Portuguese republic with socialists in power. Look at the crowded prisons, the incompetence of office holders, the extravagant and dishonest spending of taxes, see how churches, and even orphan asylums, hospitals, schools and colleges, were confiscated, how nuns were driven into the streets and told to leave the country within a given time or take the consequences; truly if that is what socialists understand by freedom, equality and brotherly love, we may place more confidence in the word of a plain cutthroat who at least means what he says.

Considering our own country the most liberal and broadminded of all countries, one should think that here at last socialists have found one country that is for the people, by the people and of the people. But even here we find them at schemes for changing the government. Bebel, if he were alive and would come to America, would not say here "politically, I am a republican." No; that would not answer. Here he would say: "Politically, I am a revolutionist." And socialists say so in America, perhaps not in these words, but their actions prove that this is their sentiment.

For the socialist the word Patriotism has no meaning. A socialist is not French, nor English, nor German, nor American, he is a socialist. He recognizes neither nation nor authority. For him

only one authority exists and that authority is international in character, commonly called "The red international."

That a socialist who lives in this country gets his bread and butter from this country, that he is being benefited and protected, are facts that never enter his mind. He works, in season and out of season, to undermine the very country that feeds him. A socialist never admits that rights impose duties. He is at all times ready to take but never to give, ever ready to destroy, never to build. It is actually impossible to imagine a socialist saying, as did Nathan Hale: "I only regret that I have but one life to give to my country."

Some time ago the question came up whether a socialist could be a citizen of this country. A judge, more far seeing than most of those who criticized him, decided that a socialist could not be a citizen of this or of any other country.

A native born citizen will, of course, not recognize a foreign authority. And a foreigner, who wishes to become a citizen of this country, must renounce allegiance to any foreign power to which he may have been attached.

How can a socialist become a loyal American citizen and at the same time remain attached to the authority of that international power whose one and only object is to undermine the lawful authority of nations and destroy all lawful government? If that is not treason, what then is treason?

Of a good citizen it is expected that he observe the laws of the land, that he stand by the constitution of the land, and acknowledge the lawful authority of it, in its threefold administration. A socialist recognizes no authority, no constitution, no law, but that which is expressed by the red, international union.

Of a good citizen it is demanded that he lend every help for the

betterment of conditions. The best of laws will have flaws. The socialist will say: "We cannot permit the working man to be content, for if he is content we lose him as a member of our international union." For that reason, whenever there is any real, constructive work being done, for the betterment of the classes, socialists will do all in their power to block a good measure.

Of a good citizen it is demanded that he stand by his country in time of peril. He must be willing to take up arms if his country is in danger, must be willing to die for it, as thousands of others have died before him in the defense of home and country. The socialist has no inclination for this duty of a citizen. He calls the soldiers of his country butchers, slaves of capital, he calls the flag of his own country a rag. If that is not treason, what is treason?

Hence it must be seen that a socialist cannot be a loyal citizen of this country. Of course, he willingly takes all the benefits the country will afford, but he refuses to recognize the duties of a citizen.

The moment an American citizen becomes a socialist he becomes a traitor to his country. If a socialist tells you that a man can be a socialist and at the same time a good American citizen he tells you a lie.

If war should break out to-morrow, Jews, Catholics, Methodists and Baptists, all parties, Whites and Blacks, would stand shoulder to shoulder in the defense of our homes, would cheerfully shed their blood on the field of battle. Where would socialists be found? Not there, for in their eyes the army of a land is a gathering of butchers, of slaves of capital, etc.

Socialists, loyal citizens of this country! As well talk of white ravens, of cold heat, as socialist citizens of America. A socialist will rail at courts, judges and laws. Yet, if by chance, he himself is

mobbed, if he gets the ill treatment he wishes so many others to get, he forthwith appeals to the same courts and judges and laws! He expresses sympathy for the people about the burden they are bearing, the taxes they are paying, and yet, if his party gets into power at some election the burdens are by no means less, nay, they become greater than before. He rails at the oppression of government, decries graft and the incompetence of officials. We have seen a socialist become mayor of a city here, and conditions grew so bad that he could hardly remain in the mayor's chair for a single term! Graft, incompetence, extravagance, corruption are not abolished by socialist rule. And such people, pulling down while others build up, destroying while others create, undermining while others construct, taking where others give, they undertake to tell us how our government should be administered, they pose as the friends of the common people and boast of their achievements and prospects. Truly, by their fruits ye shall know them, but God forbid that they ever be allowed full sway in this country.

XII. Socialism, the Enemy of the Home

It is the end and aim of socialism to produce a social disorder, the very opposite of existing law and order. Conditions of life, as we have them to-day, are the result of a Christian civilization. Christianity is the foundation of present-day law and order and of authority. Now the family is the unit in the state, and the family in Christian civilization is based upon religion. It is the Sacrament of Matrimony that binds man and wife together as one, that induces them to live up to the duties of their state of life, for their welfare and for that of their children.

Religion, then, the foundation upon which our civilization rests, is to be abolished to create a new era. Hence, too, all that depends upon this civilization must go. The family rests upon religion, hence the family must go.

Religion, it should be remembered, is no foreign growth in civilization. It is the condition without which no civilization can be possible. For when we speak of civilization we do not speak of the culture and refinement of a chosen few, such as was the condition in ancient Greece and Rome where the vast majority of men and women were ignorant slaves, but that broader and higher order where all men are free, where the strong protect the weak, where all men are equal before the law. Pagan civilization indeed shows how low man can fall, and to what depths of degradation woman may sink. If dishonor be considered greater than honor, infamy higher than righteousness, disgrace better than honesty, shame superior to modesty, let those who will, make that choice; but they should have a care not to force such distorted views upon others who are content to abide by the laws of God.

What was it that remedied the wretched conditions of pagan civilization? It was the principles of justice and charity. Of justice pagan humanity knew little and practised less. Of charity it knew nothing whatsoever. It was the teaching of Christ that renovated the face of the earth. And that change was brought about not by fire and sword, but gently and peacefully. The leaven of the Gospel worked from the bottom up. The unit of the state, the family, was the successful attempt of bringing about a change, an attempt which had been given up in despair by the greatest thinkers of those times.

Socialism has now set itself to the task of destroying the family, for the reason that it is based upon religion. Let the family fall, however, and the state will fall, law and order must fall, authority must fall, and from such state of confusion the socialist system of general disorder will naturally follow.

And why is the family to be abolished?

Socialists will tell you that marriage was instituted only in order to produce wealth, and to keep it intact for the offspring. Woman, they say, becomes degraded by marriage, she is no longer a free being, and therefore there should no longer be any family life.

We will admit that among savage tribes men buy their wives for a pair of oxen, or for whatever price they may estimate her value or ability to produce wealth. Similar things happened in pagan civilization. "But in the beginning," says Christ, "it was not so." Matrimony was instituted by Almighty God, and our dear Lord raised it to the dignity of a Sacrament. If mercenary considerations were the only motive for marriage the poor man would marry none but a wealthy woman. It would have been unheard of for a poor man to marry a poor girl. Yet we find that more poor than rich people marry, and that the married life of the poor

is, as a rule, far more happy than is the life of those who marry into fortunes. While with some money considerations will have influence, the far greater number will marry just for the power that makes the world go around—love. They may have to borrow money to pay for the ring, but they will get married nevertheless. And if they are the right kind of people they will succeed in life in spite of all obstacles.

In the remote past pagan people kept women in common. Must we go back to a state of savagery that would destroy even a trace of self-respect?

Such would be the case if the socialistic plan were actualized.

There would be no matrimony in our sense of the word. The union would last only so long as the two or one would wish it.

Ask any common-sense man or woman, and you will be told that where there is no true love there can be no happy union.

True love demands constancy of affection until death. Nor is this all. True love will desire children and will provide for them. Surely we must take it for granted that man, the highest type, can not be less perfect than the animal. Yet if man were to discard the parental instinct, he would by just that much become less perfect than the animal. The cat playing with her little kittens would be of a higher type than he. And man has the parental instinct. How can human law ever be able to root out this instinct?

Of course, socialists will say, we do not wish to deprive man of his natural instincts; no, we will make them all the better; man will not be deprived of any proper impulse, but these must be regulated and perfected so that we may produce a more perfect type of humanity.

And this is to be brought about by eugenics.

Regardless of whatever claims eugenics may make, it is obvi-

ously contrary to religion, because it endangers the unity, continuity, or indissolubility of the Sacrament of Matrimony. For this reason our faith must be opposed to this new fad of world-betterment. Nor is our religion the only reason why we must oppose it. Even common sense is opposed to it. Faith tells us that we are not merely beings of clay, but that we have within us a soul, the likeness of God. If we were beings such as cats, dogs or horses, there might be some reason in selected breeding, so far as stock raising is concerned. But our stay on earth is not the sum total of our existence. We are to live forever in a better world, for God created in us an immortal soul, made to His own image and likeness. Hence it is not so much a question of whether we are *physically* perfect human beings but whether we are so *morally*. So much for Faith. In the light of Reason eugenics fails in its claims because it fails to accomplish what it sets out to do. A man ignorant, insignificant and unknown may be the father of a great and learned man, and the children of this great man may fall back to the level of insignificance. Take the case of any great man, a great poet, musician, soldier, statesman, painter. Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe, Richard Wagner, Bismarck, Scott, Thackeray, any great men you may think of; ask whether any of these great men had a particularly gifted father, or whether any had particularly gifted offspring? Genius is not one of the inheritable qualities.

While it is an every-day occurrence that children take up the work of their fathers, yet we scarcely ever see that the children of some very brilliant man will ever come up to the standard of the father, although they may have even better opportunities so far as environment, education and opportunity are concerned.

There was only one country in history that practised eugenics.

That was Sparta. There eugenics was practised to perfection. Sparta, as a result, did produce an excellent type of manhood for fighting purposes. That was all. History has not given us a single name of this people of whom the world might be proud, by whose efforts the world was made the better. Greece, of the same period, gave the world its greatest men without eugenics. Greece gave us an Aristotle, Sophocles, Homer, Phydias, Socrates, Euclid, and a Plato. Hundreds of others might be mentioned, but these names happen to come to mind. It is true that in course of time Greece fell, but not for the lack of eugenics but owing to corruption. Sparta, too, fell in spite of her eugenics. So far, then, as history is evidence, this principle proves valueless.

Eugenics, therefore, can not solve the question of the betterment of the world. There is but one force that has shown its influence for good of mankind, and that is the Cross. There is only one force that can make people as they should be, and that is the Cross of Christ. And that force is to be destroyed by the order of socialism. What, then, will be left to lead mankind to a higher level of morality? Nothing!

Socialism claims that through Christian matrimony woman is bereft of her liberty. Woman is no longer "free." Socialism, it is said, has the lofty mission of freeing woman from her present degradation, of truly making her the equal of man.

Woman is to be free! Free from what? Woman is to be torn away from her home, her rightful shelter; is to be torn away from her children; is to be made the plaything of any man who may lust after her for a few fleeting moments, in turn pass her to another, until, after a few years, no one will want her. And what may her life be after that? In that era of freedom of woman, socialism tells us, there will be no vice. Will they eliminate passion from

human nature? Do we not see every day that the more license is granted to passion, the more unruly passion becomes? And vice is vice no matter by what name you call it.

The abolition of family life is utterly opposed to the law of nature.

As has been remarked, in the beginning of this conference, man has one instinct which no law can destroy—the parental instinct. Man and woman becoming husband and wife do so in obedience to that instinct. It is as natural for them to raise a family as it is for animals to mate for the sake of offspring. And animals do not content themselves with simply bringing young into life; they take care of them until the young are able to take care of themselves. Should man and wife show less affection for their own flesh and blood than even a wolf shows for its young? Would a human father and mother want to surrender their child upon its birth to an institution, there to be brought up by a state that will not permit the parents to be known to that child? Yet, this is exactly the ideal of "freedom" socialism says it will inaugurate.

But since the doctrines of "free love" and of the abolition of the family are offensive to decent and right-thinking people, socialists will not mention them unless they are sure of their audience. When asked to explain they will hide behind words, words, words, and they will protest that this part of their program is not an integral part of their teachings. Yet they cannot deny that Marx, Bebel, Liebknecht, and other leading socialists have incorporated the idea of free love in their system. And while some do not preach this doctrine, they practise it. They proclaim the idea of "free love" by their example, and actions always speak louder than words.

XIII. Syndicalism

Syndicalism, as it first appeared in France and Italy, and as it now manifests itself in our country under the name of the Industrial Workers of the World, the I. W. W., differs from socialism not in its aims, but in the method whereby these aims, the downfall of society and the creation of the future state, is to be brought about. Hence syndicalism bases all its arguments upon socialistic principles and, while socialism seeks to overthrow society with the aid of the ballot, syndicalism will make use of compulsion if no other means will bring about the desired results.

For that reason, whenever laxity in laws or in their enforcement, or the confusion of popular sentiment favors it, the I. W. W. seem willing to resort to compulsion as the one sure means of gaining their object.

No strike of any importance takes place in this country but the I. W. W. are on the spot to act as the self-appointed leaders. During such periods of ill-feeling it is never difficult for them to gain the support of malcontents and of trouble makers. Scatter this element among the mass of foreign working men who are strangers to our language and customs and it will be a comparatively easy task to induce these poor people to cast aside reason and to awaken in them the low instincts of revenge, of brutality and covetousness. In the hands of conscienceless and cunning leaders such people are like soft wax, and trouble with state and federal authorities is inevitable. These leaders hurl outrageous invectives against every law, human and Divine, and they soon gain their first point—the breeding of so-called "class consciousness and class hatred." From that stage to open violence is but one step. Once brought that far,

strikers will not listen to reason, to arbitration, or to sound advice, because their animal instinct has been aroused. Indeed, nothing but violence and outrage would seem to satisfy them.

It is to be deplored that we have no laws that make such aims criminal.

Ignorance is a great weapon of evil. Once a newspaper correspondent visited a mining district during a strike to interview some of the miners. He asked one man what he was striking for, and in broken English the man replied that he was striking for three dollars a day. He was asked what wages he had been receiving, and he answered that he had received three dollars and a half. It took him some time to understand that he made a big mistake in joining the strike. Not knowing English and being purposely mislead by demagogues, this man would certainly never have consented to strike if he had realized the truth. But in that case the strike leaders and their helpers would have been without an opportunity to make money. Governor Ferris, during a big strike in Michigan, was of the opinion that the strike could be easily settled if the matter were left for mine owners and working men to decide, but that it could not be settled so long as outsiders interfered, meaning the I. W. W.

The I. W. W. is nothing else but socialism gone mad. It stands not only for a strike in one industry, but for the so-called general strike that is to cripple every industry of a country. That, in turn, is to lead to a grand strike all over the civilized world. Thus the I. W. W. intends to gain its end.

The idea of a universal strike can not be based upon justice and right, because no one can reasonably demand that all business, all trades, should suffer for the grievances, real or imaginary, of but one trade. But the I. W. W. do not mind such a little thing as

justice. With this class of people only might is right. At the present time there is a big strike in Italy. Although that country is thoroughly honeycombed with anarchy and socialism, yet even there the strike is not as far-reaching as syndicalists would like to have it. These people, moreover, are not at a loss to suggest other means where a general strike proves to be impractical. The I. W. W. and syndicalists teach the working man to turn out poor work. When the employer can not be made to suffer in any other way, he is made to suffer by producing goods of poor workmanship. That is intended to injure his trade. And to help the cause along, workingmen are bidden to injure machinery and the equipment of a factory so as to compel the employer to go to great expenses. Anything and everything is allowable that the employer may be pushed to the wall. The I. W. W. fails to understand that the failure of the employer can not mean anything else but ruin for the working man, because capital and labor are not, as socialists teach, opposed to and independent of each other, but absolutely dependent upon one another. The loss of the one is the loss of the other; the gain of one is the gain of the other.

To refute syndicalism, as we have it here under the guise of the I. W. W. type, one will have to refute socialism, for every syndicalist or I. W. W. man is a socialist. Neither believes in a God, neither favors any lawfully constituted authority, neither believes in private property. Both do believe that man is a two-legged animal, a trifle higher than the monkey, from whom he has sprung, and that he is entitled to cater to all the cravings, the greed and the passions an animal may feel; as witness, for example, the socialistic doctrine of free love as taught by the leading exponents of socialism. Man must indeed sink low before he can subscribe to such teachings.

Like socialism, syndicalism is only consistent in its inconsistency. It will save people even against their will! And the remedy is so simple. Make the laborer own all machinery and all means of production! No more poverty! The poorest man is at once rich! There is no more necessity for work, for the poor man has all he wants. He has the machinery and the means of production. Heaven on earth at last. And all is so very simple—to the simple.

Before any one should grow too enthusiastic about this doctrine, let us see how such a treatment would work out in practice: The poor man would of course not be in position to buy the machinery and the means of production. The socialistic state would not allow this, because it is opposed to production for gain. For the working man it would mean no more than a change of masters. And would such a change be for the better? Let us see. At the present time the laboring man is given an equivalent for his labor that he can turn over for his own benefit. His return for work consists in cash money, that he may spend as he will. He may spend all of it, or he may lay some of it aside and by thrift and enterprise raise himself to a better condition. The messenger boy in an office, if he shows good will and thrift, may work his way up, to perhaps become the owner of the business. In the socialistic state, when private property becomes the property of the socialistic state, the working man will not get money as an equivalent for his labor, but merely an order for his meals, clothing and lodging. Where are then his opportunities of bettering his condition? Whether he is the best working man of his class or the most unreliable, all he can get is his meal ticket and an order for clothes and lodging.

Well, you may ask, for whom will such a future state be a benefit? It will be an easy living for the men who now lead our strikes, for the men with big mouths and little brains who peddle socialistic rot

in their treasonable papers, begotten in iniquity and born in sin.

The entire scheme is intended to deceive the working people and to rob them even of the little they now have, that *some* men who are too lazy to work may have a way of making a living without running the constant risk of landing in jail for vagrancy.

During the strike of the woollen mills in the East, the I. W. W. came out with their true colors when they bore a flag aloft with the motto: "We want no God, no flag, no masters."

Of course the I. W. W. do not want a God, for simple reasons. The laws of God are rather irksome for these people. Since adultery, stealing and coveting of other people's properties is to be made lawful and desirable, they have, of course, no use for a God who forbids and punishes such doings.

The I. W. W. want no flag. Their one aim is to fight and destroy this country, and every other lawfully constituted government, for the simple reason that every lawfully constituted government must enforce the laws of God as the natural law of the land. The laws of every country are opposed to theft, robbery, confiscation and adultery. Not a single civilized people has ever legalized theft, robbery, confiscation or adultery. These crimes violate the natural rights of man.

If I see a house, the appearance of which does not impress me very favorably, have I the right to call out the owner, or to drag him out if he fails to come out, and compel him to tear down his house and build another according to *my* ideas? So long as the owner is satisfied to live in that house, and so long as it gives him all the comforts he wants, what right have I to interfere? If the laws of this country, its institutions, its forms of government and its government do not suit the liking of the I. W. W., they are at perfect liberty to leave this country and return to their original

homes. No one asked them or compelled them to come here or to stay here. No one is compelled to become a citizen of this nation; but, if from a free choice one does become a citizen, he is by the very fact obliged under a solemn oath to uphold its laws and institutions. There is but one name for people such as Benedict Arnold—the name of traitor.

The I. W. W. want no masters. That, too, is plain. When did we ever hear the I. W. W. pose as servants? They are never satisfied unless they can be the self-appointed masters. They must either run things or ruin them. Let me ask just one question: Under what conditions will the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness be safer? Under a rule of law and order, a lawfully constituted government, or under the mob rule of lawlessness and riot?

Nothing better could happen than that American people would study the I. W. W. aims. It is high time for our people to open their eyes, to see the true intent and purpose of a lawless and irresponsible mob going shamelessly from one end of the country to the other to openly spread treason against God, against home and country.

XIV. Woman Suffrage

It might seem as though the feminist movement or the woman question were out of place in a series of conferences intended for men. Yet, since the question has become as popular with the daily press and has of late years gained so much ground, it will not be out of place to discuss this movement in a general way.

Looking at this movement superficially one might be led to think that it is nothing more than the expression of lonely females who, because they could not find a man to reform, have set out to reform the whole world.

This idea, however, does not embrace the whole of the woman question.

For years back the woman question has formed a most important plank in every socialistic platform throughout the world. But the movement gained friends and supporters also outside of socialism, chiefly for the simple reason that the movement was not fully understood by those who favored it. The most ardent promoters and supporters are, however, found mostly among the socialists.

There are those who see in the woman question nothing less than the only solution of several economic questions. To prevent the public at large from seeing the true scope of the question, the advocates of woman suffrage emphasize certain points as though they were the end and aim of all their efforts. So we find them talking eloquently and with much pathos about subjects such as better working hours for girls and women, the abolition or at least the regulation of child labor, the bringing about of better sanitary conditions in shops and factories, better housing conditions in tenement districts, playgrounds for children, and other things that are really desirable. We

are given to understand that all these improvements can be brought about only by letting women use the ballot along with men. We are informed by their orators that most, if not all, evils of the day will pass away forever once women are given the vote. Woman will be the unrelenting and conquering foe of graft and corruption. Politics will become clean and wholesome the very day woman casts her vote!

You may have heard the fable about the rainbow. The fable says that where a rainbow touches the earth there will be found immense deposits of gold. All one has to do is to locate the spot where the rainbow touches the earth, go to that place and dig. Strange to say there are people who give credence to this fable, a further proof that there is nothing so foolish and unreasonable but it finds supporters.

The woman movement is not needed for the betterment of mankind. The reforms which it claims to seek have been outlined by men years before "votes for women" became an issue. Reforms such as now urged by women are being continually adopted, not because women raise their voices for these reforms, but because men see the justice of them.

What then is the real motive of this woman movement?

As has been said, socialism stands for universal suffrage, meaning to place woman on an equal footing with man. Every human being, so socialism affirms, should have a vote, for all are equal. The present civilization, socialism tells us, has enslaved woman, has made her a household drudge, the slave of shop or factory, the body servant or slave of man in our form of marriage. Woman is the slave of man's passion, and socialism poses as the new champion of woman, to give her liberty.

The idea may not be new to most of you; but just think what

grand oratory can be built around that subject by men and women alike. Woman, a slave, and socialism the fearless champion who rescues her and gives to her her long lost freedom! Who can blame women for not wanting to be slaves any longer? Who can blame socialism when out of pure love for mankind it takes up the cause of the downtrodden female sex?

Much oratory is being wasted in telling us that woman is the equal of man, that she is entitled to hold every office of trust and power that now man holds to be his prerogative, that she is man's equal in education, brains, and strength of character, and that she is thereby qualified to hold any and every position of trust within the giving of the voter. All of which sounds very plausible to people who fail to detect the juggling of words.

Let us ask what is the meaning of such equality of sexes?

If it is intended to mean the carrying out of real economic reforms we doubt the sincerity of socialism in espousing such a cause. Socialism does not really want reforms of any kind. A leading German socialist has remarked that it is unwise to make the workingman content by abolishing abuses. The moment the workingman has been made contented by reforms he will cease to be a socialist, hence it must be the policy of socialism to keep the workingman discontented. That of course will be a great help to make him pay more dues, give more salaries to socialist leaders, it will also help to keep up the work of treasonable papers and give work to soapbox orators. That is why socialists have fought every reform up to date. Socialism does not want reform but still greater abuse; does not want order, but disorder; not evolution, but revolution; not peace, but war.

Hence, while socialism may grow eloquent and even pathetic over real and imaginary abuses that the vote of woman will alone be able

to remedy, it desires, more than anything else, the taking away of woman from her rightful sphere,—the home,—so that in the unequal fight with stronger man for honors and position she may become the tool, the plaything of man, the creature to which socialistic "free love" has condemned her. Stripped of all its fine words, this is the unavoidable outcome and aim of the woman movement. It may sound harsh and cruel; but truly, the path of the woman movement does not lead to freedom, but to slavery; not to honor, but to disgrace; not to power, but to shame.

Every right has its corresponding duty. The right to vote imposes duties and responsibilities. The Fathers of our Country fully realized the burden of duties that goes with the right of the vote and for that reason they wisely confined the franchises to the male citizens. The right of voting imposes the duty of taking up arms for the country, of serving on juries, of holding office, etc.

No one will deny that woman possesses patriotism. We find women on the field of battle as angels of mercy, attending the wounded and the dying. But we should not want woman to shoulder a gun or direct the firing of cannon. It is the teaching of our dear Saviour Jesus Christ that has raised womanhood upon a pedestal of honor. In honoring her who said: "From now on all generations shall call me blessed," we at the same time pay homage to the sex which she represents. To give to this christianized and sanctified womanhood the ballot will not elevate her, but endanger her by taking her out of her sanctified sphere.

It is true that in the last fifty years economic conditions have changed considerably with regard to woman's work. But the change is only temporary in character.

In the days of our grandfathers it was practically unheard of that daughters did any work outside of housework. But at the

present time one will see strange sights if we were to look at the world through the glasses of our grandfathers.

If we stand at a factory at sundown we may see nearly as many women as men coming out of its doors.

While in the days of our grandfathers housework was considered the fitting and honorable occupation of womankind, now it seems looked upon as almost a disgraceful occupation, reserved for girls of foreign birth. The majority of girls of to-day prefer to do work outside of the home where they imagine they enjoy more liberty, yet the fact remains that girls never think of staying at work very long. They look forward to a chance to get married; and the girl, though she be prepared ever so poorly for the real work of her life, makes haste to marry. Marriage and a home are the desire of most girls. Their very nature is drawn towards the life for which the Creator has made them.

The vast majority of female employees is composed of young women of marriageable age. We may find a small percentage of those who for some reason or other, are obliged to support old parents, and women who are compelled to go out to work even after marriage either because their husbands have become invalids, or those unfortunates whose husbands refuse to provide for them. Apart from these exceptions women as a rule look upon shop, factory or office work not as a life work but a temporary means of earning a living.

You see, then, that while social and economic conditions have changed since the days of our grandfathers, home is still the cherished goal for which womanhood strives. A young woman may for a time become a wage earner, but she never intends that this work should deprive her of the chance of having a home of her own in some future day. Disappoint her in this ambition, this hope, and

all the money of the world will not recompense her for her shattered ideal

And of this lofty and sacred ideal, socialism wishes to deprive womanhood by holding out the alluring bait of "votes for women." This is, then, what the emancipation of woman means. For be it well understood, the "votes for women" movement is the means that finally leads to the destruction of home and family.

This assertion is often ridiculed. We are asked, how can the walk to the voting booth and depositing a vote deprive woman of her highest ideal, the home and the family? We are asked how the casting of a ballot can interfere with womanhood. How unreasonable men are, we are told; a woman can still remain a woman even though she casts a vote.

It is true that an occasional trip to the voting booth will not necessarily interfere with a woman's work, or her home life. But how about the duties that the right of the vote brings with it? Is woman to serve as juror together with men, is she to be a sheriff, or a soldier; is she to take active part in politics and still be able to live a home-life with husband and children? Socialists will say: "Why, of course, she can. If the public life to which woman is entitled interferes with home and family life, why, abolish the family! That is exactly what we have been trying to get into your heads all these years! Marriage, home and family life are a capitalistic scheme to keep woman enslaved. Woman should be free of all these old-fashioned restraints. Woman is the equal of man. Down with a system that keeps woman in chains. Love should be the only reason for the union of the sexes; when love ends the union ends!"

Now let us suppose that in the socialistic state woman is the equal of man in all political, social and economic rights; what woman will want to bear the burden that man does not have to bear, the bringing

forth of children? It would be interference with her liberty to enter the gates of death for the one reason of bringing another human being into this world. But before socialism can bring about such an abnormal state of affairs it will have to change the very nature of woman. Woman will remain woman. She looks forward to home and motherhood instinctively as to her highest ambition, her noblest duty, and hence the feminist movement will never be successful in gaining the support of real womanlike women.

We see this in the lack of interest shown in elections where women have been allowed to vote for some years. The novelty wears off very quickly, and then women will find their own occupations more attractive than politics.

It is idle to say, finally, that women are naturally better and more honest than men. We find the same traits of human nature in both sexes.

A female senator would be as much exposed to bribes, flattery and the evil influences of corrupt bodies as her brother. We meet with honest and dishonest women as we meet with honest and dishonest men. It is just as easy, perhaps easier, to influence women as to influence men. Temptation may corrupt the one as the other.

This does not mean that woman should not exert a wholesome influence in our social and political life. There are some phases in the life of the nation where woman can do great service. We desire the welfare of mankind and welcome any help that woman can legitimately offer. But the greatest help she can and must give to that end in the position that God has Himself assigned to her, in the position as wife and mother.

XV. True Morality versus Socialistic Morality

In harmony with its theory of evolution socialism has evolved a new sort of morality that is to eventually replace the old kind, which they claim was wrongfully imposed upon an enslaved people. This new morality is to liberate people from the toils of the rich, who are accused of having dictated the policy of religion and framed laws not for the common good, but for the benefit of a favored few. Socialism is to put an end to all such abuses, and for that reason has devised a morality of its own. Let us see what it is. Like everything else with which socialism deals, so has its morality, too, gone through a process of evolution. In fact it is still evolving itself. It appears that morality had little occupation, so far as socialists are concerned, and thus it had much leisure to attend to the business of evolving, and it is still at it. Socialistic morality had no standard by which, or according to which, it had to evolve itself. The same erratic influences that evolved all the rest of the socialistic theory guided the evolving of socialistic morality. Something that was right a year ago may be doubted this year, and be regarded as positively wrong next year, because this morality has to keep on evolving. And since there is no limit to its evolution, this morality will merrily go on evolving as long as time or socialism will last.

Such remarkable evolution in morality serves a twofold purpose.

In the first place there is no need of a God in socialistic evolution. And since there is no Superior Being to whom man might be responsible, man is said to be his own judge in deciding whether an

act is good or bad. In the second place there can be practically no wrong of any kind, for some time or other in its evolution socialistic morality will consider right what is now thought to be wrong, and vice versa.

Against this constant change to which its morality is subjected, socialism has figured out two chief rules by which actions may be considered good or bad. One rule is expediency, the other is the old utilitarian principle.

Hence whatever is expedient is good; what is inexpedient is doubtful or altogether wrong. At the present time, for example, Confiscation, even the mere mention of it, is not expedient. People will not hear of it. Therefore confiscation is wrong. But should there ever come a time when confiscation becomes expedient, when a majority of people clamor for it, then confiscation will be right and lawful. Thus the same act may be a theft at one time, and a righteous act at onother time. An excellent system of morality for train robbers, hold-up men, yegg men, revolutionists and strong-arm men in general!

The utilitarian principle, the second rule by which socialism defines morality, was discovered by the pagan world long before people ever dreamed of a scheme as irreconcilable with reason as is socialism. According to the ancient pagan system an action is good or bad, as either a benefit or a harm follows it. So honesty will be a good action if good follows it. But if a greater benefit can be obtained by dishonesty, then dishonesty is praiseworthy. This pagan morality may be summed up with the question so often heard today: "What is there in it for me?"

The outcome of such a system of morality was the downfall of pagan civilization.

Are we now by this same sort of morality to re-enact the un-

speakable crimes committed in pagan times? Are we to return to the horrors of the French revolution, that made vicious beasts of men? Is this socialistic morality anything else but an excuse for the gratification of the lower passions of man? It is just that and nothing more.

Now let us look at the character of *true* morality.

True morality does not depend upon expediency, does not depend upon self-interest, does not change from time to time, nor is it devised for the material gain of man. There *is* a higher authority than man and that authority is none else than God, whom socialism would like to argue out of the world.

An example will best explain the necessity of an authority higher than man.

Let us suppose that a foot measure equalled twelve inches in New York, fourteen in the Middle West, and ten inches in California and that all three parts of the country claimed having the correct measure of a foot. What confusion would arise in buying and selling. To further complicate matters some might shorten the size of an inch. Where would the confusion end if each man could lengthen or shorten the measure as he liked?

To avoid just such a state of confusion and resulting dishonesty the federal government steps in and defines the exact measure of foot and inch. The federal government, moreover, sends out inspectors to compel store-keepers and merchants to regulate their weights and measures according to the federal standard, under penalty of fine and imprisonment.

Thus it is arranged that throughout the entire country measures and weights are uniform.

Similarly when we speak of morality we mean the conforming of our thoughts, words and deeds with a certain standard applicable

to all human beings. There can never be two standards, one for the rich and influential and another for the less fortunate, because that would destroy the foundation of morality. Moreover, this standard of principle must be binding and authoritative. He who knowingly and willingly acts contrary to this standard must be made to answer for his conduct. And where is the power than can exert such authority upon all mankind? The power that can control and guide our actions and even thoughts, must be all wise, all just, all knowing and almighty. Hence true morality means the conforming of our will in thoughts, words and actions, with the holy will of God. He is the supreme Lord, Lawgiver and Creator, and as such has the right to demand conduct in conformance with His Laws. Moreover, in His perfect justice He is bound to reward those who follow His Law, and to punish those who disobey it.

The true standard of right and wrong must therefore be the standard God Himself has decreed. Things are not made right or wrong by the opinion of an individual man, or even by a body of men, but because in the all-perfect mind of God, Who does and Who knows all things well, right and wrong, justice and injustice, virtue and vice, are clearly and unmistakably defined. That standard remains the same throughout eternity, from it there can be no appeal, because there is no higher authority than that of God. Nor is that standard optional with man, but binding in conscience for all mankind.

Now let us see how this standard of God applies to the laws of this or any other country.

All human laws are good if they conform with the Law of God. Any human law which goes contrary to God's law is by that very fact unjust, and we must then exclaim with the prince of the Apostles: "We must obey God rather than man." Human laws

which are dictated by expediency, politics, or self-interest, will and can never really promote the temporal welfare of a people. The happiness of nations depends upon laws based upon the Ten Commandments of God, and upon their fearless and faithful enforcement. In the downfall of a people we will invariably find that either the laws of the people did not conform with the law of God, or, if they did, they were not enforced faithfully.

From all this you must understand that religion *does* play a very important part in the framing and enforcing of laws and in the promotion of temporal happiness.

Since then even the temporal happiness of home and country depends upon laws that are in conformity with the law of God, the sacred duty you owe to home and country must be plain to you. In our land of freedom the people themselves are responsible for all laws that are framed, and they are responsible for their enactment and enforcement. If our legislators enact and enforce unjust law *we* are responsible, because by our votes we can defeat men who are untrue to their duty.

It is not for clergymen or bishops to enter the halls of our legislature. That would at once raise a cry from New York to California, and from the North to the South. Ministers of other denominations may do so and be praised by the public press for broadness of mind, toleration, fairmindedness, and so on. But if a Catholic priest or bishop ventured to enter the halls of State, as an official or lecturer, it would at once be said that the Pope of Rome has invaded the sacred temple of law and has enchained the land. So it remains for you, Catholic men, to assert yourselves in the interest of true morality, by using your good judgment in the voting booth.

Bear in mind that voting is a matter of conscience, and that the time will come when you will have to render an account of the bal-

lots you have cast, along with the other things for which you are responsible.

Upon you, my Catholic men, will it depend a great deal, what kind of laws are made, what kind of education will be given to your children, whether honesty or dishonesty will reign, whether the right sort of morality will prevail or not.

Socialism with its false standard of morality should be rejected by the conscientious voters of all creeds. It is good neither in the sight of God or man.

XVI. Economic Determinism

Socialism has a double set of doctrines, one for the common people who are not of the inner circle, the other for the elect.

For the ordinary public, the laboring men, it poses as an uplift party. It bears a name of its own, forms a distinct political party, and the glittering promises it makes to labor are by no means few in number. As political party it poses for everything that makes for better conditions in the laboring world. But all these promises are only so much bait for the sake of catching votes, for, after all, socialism is not the friend but the enemy of labor. It secretly fights the labor unions that have really benefitted labor. They of the inner circle are the elect, who really control the party and know of its true aim and object. One might compare socialism to a vast secret society, the majority of whose members even do not know its officers. A vast body of men led and directed by men unknown to them, a vast majority of men who know absolutely nothing of the ulterior aims and objects, known only to the higher few. Socialism is a body of men the majority of whom are unaware of its real aim and object, following, as sheep follow the herd, without knowing why they follow or whither they are going. The real motive and purpose of socialism is the overthrow of society as now constituted, and the placing of social democracy in its stead. Socialism wants to abolish all law and order, all lawfully constituted government, all rights of property, all religion, even the home; to herd men together like cattle and to make them work for the benefit of a few socialistic leaders.

Socialism, no doubt, is wise in trying to hide its real aim and purpose, for if the public at large were aware of the truth the

law against treason might be invoked against them. Therefore socialism poses as a political party, with just the most alluring promises for the laboring man, whom it secretly intends to rob of all he has.

The promises that socialism makes are clothed in a phraseology of which the ordinary public can hardly understand the long and high sounding words. But with many people a high sounding phrase, proclaimed with a great deal of unction, will make favorable impression, and one point, gaining the sympathy of an unsuspecting public, is achieved.

An example of such verbiage is seen in the word: *economic determinism.*

Determinism means a sort of fatalism, for it denies absolutely the freedom of the will in man. It means that every action is determined by the action that went before it. According to socialistic reasoning every event, every act, is but the necessary and inevitable outcome of the event or action that went before. It means that there is no simple event or action due to the free will of man; that there was always some previous act or event that gave it its determination. Such a determination, as defined by Stuart Mill and adopted by socialism, is wrong because it leaves no room either for the free will of man or for the working of Divine Providence.

Naturally, socialists see a wonderful mind in a man like Stuart Mill, because he gives them a clue for an explanation of the world and all it contains without having to call in God as the First Cause. Whatever seems to explain things without the necessity of God is a welcome help for socialistic doctrine.

Economic determinism intends to explain things without having to admit a God as the First Cause. Hence determinism is mentioned so frequently by people who cannot reason correctly. De-

terminism is applied to many different matters. Every phase in political, social and moral life is made to conform to determinism, as also the economic aspect of the social question.

To-day we will confine ourselves to economical determinism, to inquire what that mysterious term stands for. Determinism is here connected with the word economic to mean that whatever goes by the name of "economic" is governed inevitably by the actions or events that preceded economic matters, as for instance the price of labor, living conditions, and so on. Of course it would not do to say that the price of butter this week was determined by its price last week, and so on. Economic determinism does more than that! Since socialism gets along without a God and yet must have a way of explaining matters, this economic determinism comes in very handily to demonstrate how economic conditions determine the life and conduct of man.

Thus, socialism would have the events of the world depend upon the price of a ton of hay rather than upon our free will. Of course, such an explanation of the conduct of man, taking from him all responsibility, is a great boon to evil-doers. According to this socialistic doctrine there need be no laws, no judges, no courts, no juries, no fines, no prisons, because man is not responsible for what he does; he simply obeys "economic" conditions. Man will do one thing if butter is forty cents a pound, and another when it is only twenty; but one cannot blame the man for his actions: they depend on the price of the butter. Nonsense, surely, yet this nonsense is clothed in high sounding words and phrases, and then passes for gospel truths. To mislead people is always found safe policy by socialism. Big words are used, high-sounding phrases are coined, all with the necessary unction. These are the tactics of the soap-box orator as well as of the "intellectual" socialist. With them they

gain the ready ear of the malcontent who claims that the world owes him a living which he is too lazy to collect, of the criminally inclined who finds a ready excuse for evil actions, of the laboring classes who, because they cannot reason properly are easily misled, and of the political healer who feeds upon others.

What man with any common sense can say that labor, or the purchase price of a commodity, has an inevitable and irresistible influence upon an historical event? What is it that sets the price on a ton of coal? Is it the price of the former ton of coal? And what relation has the price of coal on the moral conduct of man? Will it make man any better or any worse when the price of coal is up! As well we might say that the time-table of a railway is conditioned by its previous time-table. If that were the case how did the first time table ever come into existence?

People who wish to find a reason for the world according to the pagan view that admits of no God, will invariably fall into the error of making any event or act depend upon an act or event that preceded it. An example will illustrate the unreliability of this method. A State or county votes for prohibition. A year later statistics are compiled and it is found that bank deposits have increased, crops are larger, and so on. Now if one would argue that these things are the result of prohibition, he may make a serious mistake because there are other causes that may have been instrumental in the favorable showing. Good crops, propitious weather, and other such conditions, have nothing to do with prohibition.

As a fine phrase "economic determinism" may sound well, but beyond that it amounts to nothing. Yet, as senseless as it is, socialism applies the term to social and political conditions, making man nothing more than a helpless reed, blown here and there by every gust of wind.

According to socialism, we simply cannot help ourselves. We are what we are, and have no idea what we will be next, but even though we should happen to know it, and should not like it, we cannot help ourselves, because a previous condition over which we had no control, has already decided what we are to be and do next. Now, if such is the case, if we are nothing but a tool of a blind fate without feeling or reason, of what use can be the ballot to socialism? How can socialism proclaim economic determinism as the only explanation of the universe, and still say that it can help people in bringing heaven upon earth if men will only vote the Socialist ticket. That certainly means a free and voluntary act on the part of the people. How can they act of their free will and still believe in economic determinism?

We know that various products are related to one another and dependent upon one another. The price of butter will depend upon the number of cows and the kind of pasture and feed the cows get. If food is expensive, farmers may prefer to kill their cattle and naturally butter will rise in price. Leather may rise or go down in price according to the supply and price of cattle; the price of meat will go up or down for similar reasons, and so on.

Such examples, however, do not prove the truth of "economic determinism," for the simple reason that all these things depend upon the law of supply and demand, and not upon previous conditions. The law of supply and demand is within the control of man. It is within his power to increase the supply if the demand is large, or if the supply be short he can lessen the demand by raising the price of the commodity. All this speaks for the free will of man.

While it is true that various commodities are related to one another, and that the scarcity of the one will have a bearing upon

the price of another related to it, it is *not* true that *all* things are finally controlled by the price of one thing; it is *not* true that the price of hay, coal, bread and so on, has an irresistible and inevitable effect upon making a man good or bad.

Socialism in striving to make of man a beast of a higher order, falls upon the absurdity of "economic determinism," and finds willing believers among those who love neither God nor mankind.

XVII. Surplus Value

Another favorite expression we find in socialistic literature is "surplus value." It is the basis for the claim that labor produces all wealth.

We have in a former conference shown the fallacy of this claim and will now examine it from the point of view of surplus value.

In socialistic writings so many high-sounding words are so often used to hide the real intent and meaning of principle, so many well-turned phrases are coined to screen contradictions, that it is no small matter to get at the little kernel in all the chaff of words.

Stripping this theory of Marx from all ornamental language and all empty words, surplus value simply means the value of labor which a man gives to his employer over and above the money he receives in wages. A man, let us say, will be given fifty cents an hour for his labor. During that hour in which he earns fifty cents he produces an article worth a dollar to the employer. Hence, while for the day he gets four dollars for his labor, the employer received a cash value of eight dollars in the product which this laborer yielded during the day. By this argument socialists seek to prove that the laborer who produced eight dollars in cash value is cheated out of four dollars by his employer, who gets the difference without earning it. That, in the logic of the socialist, proves why the employer gets richer while the laborer stays poor. Whereas labor creates all wealth it receives only a small fraction of what it produces. All the rest rolls into the pockets of employers, who do absolutely nothing to create value.

If this figuring of socialists were correct, employers would be thieves and usurpers. However, let us look at the real facts.

The difference between the pay of the laborer and the price paid by the consumer does not go into the pocket of the man who employs the laborer. This difference of value is divided among many people who all do their share of labor in bringing the product to the ultimate consumer.

Does surplus value really mean a clear profit to the employer? Let us see!

The employer has to furnish the site for the factory building, he must build the factory, pay for the insurance on the buildings, instal machinery, make repairs, keep office help, clerks, book-keepers, stenographers, and so on; he has to employ salesmen, has to advertise his goods, buy raw material out of which the finished product is made. All of this means a big outlay for him. After he has seen that all these expenses are met, there come expenses for shipping, commissions for agents, and he must sell the product so reasonably that the retailer is enabled to get his rent, insurance and living out of the sale of the article. How much of the surplus value really remains in the pocket of the employer after he has paid all bills? If, at the end of a year, he can figure a gain of from six to eight per cent. on his investment, he is well satisfied.

The socialistic idea that surplus value means a robbery of the laboring man, who is being deprived of the results of his labor, and an unjust and unfair gain for the employer, who reaps where he has not sown, is nothing but so much nonsense.

Yet socialists are never at a loss to flourish made-to-order figures and statistics to give their false claims the semblance of truth.

For the sake of argument let us presume the case that the laborer would have to produce only so much in value as the amount he

receives in wages, that he would work for four hours instead of eight, and produce exactly what he earns and nothing more. What would be the result?

We could not suppose that the manufacturer would put up buildings out of charity, that he would set up machinery, buy raw material, pay for clerical work, pay all advertising, and pay the salaries of agents, traveling men, taxes and insurance. Nor can we expect that manufacturers of raw material and shipping concerns like railways and navigation companies will work for nothing. All must seek their share of pay in the manufacturing and in the distribution of commodities.

If, then, the laboring man will work for four hours instead of eight, putting out only as much cash value of products as he receives in his own wages, the result will be there is no value out of which to pay the many expenses which besides labor enter into manufacturing and selling.

Socialism makes a great mistake in sizing up society. Society does not consist of independent units self-sufficient for their own wants, but in reality it is a well defined organization of many parts, each one depending upon the other for requirements. The human body does not consist of separate and independent parts that can act independent of one another, but of parts that are united one to the other, each one having a function of its own, but each depending upon the other for its life and usefulness. In a like manner society consists not of independent and separate parts, but of parts one depending upon the other for its life and usefulness. Now, since we all form one body, or organization, it stands to reason that we cannot act independently of each other without causing harm to the entire social body. It is necessary for us to give if we want to receive. A set of knives and forks are not expensive. Yet, have

you ever thought what it costs in labor and danger of life to produce the steel from which knife and fork are made. In iron foundries men stand stripped to the waist, sweating in the terrific heat and their bodies covered with soot. The miners getting the iron ore from the bowels of the earth risk their lives daily, so that we may get, among other things, our knife and fork. So the laboring man in shop and factory, like all the rest of society, must do his share towards the welfare and benefit of society.

With society, as it is necessarily organized, it is a constant giving and taking. In this it differs from socialism which desires the taking but does not want to know about giving.

Thus you see that the so-called surplus value is not an injustice against the laboring man. It does not mean that the employer pockets it. It is nothing but the share which the laboring man contributes to the welfare of society of which he is a member. He does no more than do others who contribute in other ways their share for the support of society. The rich man is bound to contribute his share for the welfare of society as well as the laboring man. Nor, indeed, is the matter of giving to society an optional matter.

The giving and taking in human society must of necessity be regulated, in justice to all the parts making up society. It would not be just for one part of society to receive all the benefits while the other does all the work. There have been times in the past when privileged classes took from society an undue share of benefits. That, however, was unnatural and abnormal, and does not change the truth that all must contribute their just share for the welfare of society. In justice there must be a due proportion between that what we take from and that what we give to society.

Tramps, vagabonds and idlers give nothing to society; hence

they have no right to demand anything from society. The rich man is bound to give more to society than the laboring man, for the simple reason that he gets more from society. The benefits received must be in just proportion to what we do for and give to society.

As to the laws that should regulate this giving and taking we have two very good laws. They are brief, and have no exceptions. They are: "Thou shalt not steal," and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods."

"Surplus value" may be as fine a phrase as "economic determinism," if proclaimed with impressive gestures and stirring voice; but so far as its meaning is concerned it has none. It is just a bait to catch the unwary. It is useful for creating hatred of classes, for fooling the people, and for furthering the ulterior purpose of socialism, namely, robbing the poor of the little they have.

It has never yet made clear how the wealthy among the socialists harmonize the profits which they willingly take with their principle of surplus value.

If socialists are so positive that surplus value is nothing but an unearned profit for the employer, they should be the very first to let the laborers in their establishments produce only as much as their wages represent and not one cent's worth more. Socialists can not help knowing they are wrong when they speak of surplus value as unearned profit; but they must keep up the deception in order to fool the people, and thus to further their unholy aims.

XVIII. Reform or Anarchy—Which?

If you should have the misfortune to suffer from a disorder of your body it is not likely that you will send for a blacksmith or carpenter but for a physician. Common sense will tell you to get a competent man. Needless to say there are doctors and doctors. Suppose that the doctor you have summoned should say: "My dear man, yours is a peculiar case and I will not be able to say what ails you until your life is gone and I can dissect your body, but I am anxious to know what ails you and hence it will be best if I kill you so that we may learn the root of the trouble." Would you be satisfied to have him kill you to find out what ails you? Would you not rather holler with all the strength of your lungs, and have this dangerous man thrown out? A competent doctor will not seek to kill you to ascertain what ails you, but will do his best to keep you alive and to improve your condition.

Society is in the position of a sick man.

Is it necessary to murder society, to destroy civilization, to abolish law and order, to overthrow the lawfully constituted government, to slay rulers of the country, to rob men of their lawful possessions, to reduce the whole world to chaos, in order to find a cure? When life is destroyed, of what good is the cure? Is it necessary to revoke every progress made in two thousand years, and start again with the stone-age, when the hides of animals formed the only known clothing, and caves the only shelter?

And yet, if you listen to socialistic orators, that is just what they tell you; society must first be destroyed and then a cure will be found in the creation of the "future state." That will include the abolition

of labor for profit. Mankind would be fed, clothed and mated by overseers. And how long would mankind stand for such slavery! There would quickly be another revolution.

Society will do well to stay away from such socialistic doctrines that teach no remedy but destruction.

If an inventor desired to give to the world some new machine, how much interest do you think people would take in his invention if instead of a working model he would write only lengthy books. Especially those who take an interest in new inventions, and who are willing to back them with money, do not want books or papers about that new machine, but a real working model of the same. This working model will be studied, examined and tested by experts, to see whether it comes up to expectations and whether it fulfills the claims which the inventor has made for it. If it does not do the work the inventor claims for it, people will turn away disappointed. But when engineers, and others, who take an interest in the invention, are convinced that the working model does all the excellent work the inventor claims for it, it will not take long for capital to become interested. Factories will be built from which that fine machine will be put on the market, and the general public will not be slow in buying it.

If a man would come to you and say: "Look here, I believe that I can make heaps of money if you will help me to get a patent. I am working on a machine that will catch the rain as it falls and extract gold from it. But I need much money to put that machine together, and I was wondering whether you would not help me. As soon as I get my machine in working order you will get your money back and more besides, so much in fact that you will not know what to do with it." You will not have to be a wise man to know this poor fellow is insane.

Here, then, is socialism with a new invention. It wants to abolish poverty, vice, crime, misery of all kinds, and make of this earth a paradise. All of which may sound beautiful, but—alas and alack—socialism has no working model by which it could prove that its invention will do what is claimed. Socialism has flooded the world with a deluge of literature proclaiming its wonderful invention. It engages orators, publishes papers, organizes political parties, doing all this for the glory and financial benefit of socialistic bosses; but it has no working model by which it can prove a single one of its many assertions. Why then should any sane man take any stock in all the wild talk of socialism!

Socialists have certainly tried hard to produce a working model of their impossible theory. They tried it, not only once but many times, in nearly every country of the globe. But for some reason or other the model never worked. The people over whose present-day-misery socialists grow so eloquent in their books, papers and speeches, soon grew tired of being slaves while their masters pocketed all profits, and they disbanded in disgust. If socialists could point to even one successful working model, how proudly they would proclaim, "Behold and see! We *have* a perfect working model! See how happy our people are. Ask them if they will ever go back to the old civilization." Books would be written about the happy colony, its pictures would be spread broadcast, excursion trains would be run to the colony to let people see for themselves that socialism after all has the one and only remedy for all the ills of mankind. Alas, socialists cannot point to a single successful venture of this kind, and as often as they may try in the future, their schemes will come to nothing because they are unable to change human nature. One cannot start out from a wrong principle and follow it without sinking deeper and deeper into error. Realizing their

failures to put their doctrines into practice, socialists have a remarkable explanation. They must admit that, so far as a working model is concerned, socialism is impossible of demonstration. But, they continue, when all the world will join, it is bound to work out right. As well they might say that two and two will of course never make five; but two million plus two million will make five million!

Can any but an insane mind accept such an argument? Socialism wants first to destroy our civilization and then improve it, whereas present-day abuses may be remedied by keeping civilization alive!

Our country *is* a good working model of a government as perfect as human ingenuity can devise. Its laws and courts and its constitution are based upon the experience that humanity has gathered in the course of centuries. Our executive authority comes not from self-appointed kings, but from our equals whom we appoint to office.

This government, as a working model, shows to the world we have here better opportunities for life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, than in any country under the sun. If that were not the case it would hardly be likely that so many people of foreign countries would want to come to America, to find a new and better home under the Stars and Stripes.

If by some calamity—which God forbid—this country of ours should go down to defeat, humanity would be compelled to struggle on for centuries again before it could again build up a working model as perfect as is our government. In the meantime generations would have to struggle through anarchy without ever seeing the dawn of freedom.

That there are faults and abuses in our land, no one who has eyes to see and ears to hear will deny. To abuse means putting a worthy or good object to evil use. To destroy or abolish something because someone has abused it would be rank folly. Should

we destroy all railway systems because a man is run over by a train? The death may have been an accident, it may have been due to the carelessness of the engineer or of the victim. But in either case we would not be reasonable in asking the destruction of all railways. Railways are indispensible, and accidents can usually be avoided by exercising proper care.

In like manner it would be folly to condemn all lawful government for any shortcoming that can be remedied if laws are properly made and enforced.

Let us take to heart the answer which king Frederick of Prussia gave to citizens who came to see him about having the burgomaster of their town removed. The king listened to them and then asked who had appointed the mayor. "We did, Your Majesty," the citizens replied, "we elected him." "Then it serves you right, you foolish men! Elect a better man the next time."

When we elect the wrong men for public office we have no reason and no excuse for complaints. The fault is ours. We should have used better judgment.

Reform or anarchy—which? What should be done, and who should take it upon himself to work for a betterment of conditions, to do away with abuses so that this government of ours may at all times be a perfect working model?

To help intelligently and effectively in this grand task, you Catholic men of this country must become well informed of the needs of the times, of the abuses that must be done away with, and of the remedy that must be applied. You should know why socialism, or any other "ism," is incapable of improving conditions. Seek information so that you may be able to see through the fallacies that are spread broadcast, and to administer the antidote to counteract the poison that threatens from a daily press hostile to God.

Take a lively and intelligent interest in all public affairs. Attend the meetings of the union to which you belong, or should belong, and when it is time for you to speak, speak as a man who is not afraid to voice his convictions. Labor unions, like any other body, may make mistakes, and have made mistakes, but the fault was with those who for some reason or other would not speak up for truth and right. Attend the conferences of your society, read Catholic papers to become posted in matters of the labor-question and kindred topics, and be as fearless to speak in behalf of truth as are those others who champion error. Remember that every election-day means the duty for you to vote. Nine-tenths of all political abuses would never happen if all voters would vote honestly and intelligently. Know those whom you are voting into office. Watch the state and national law-making. If a law is proposed that will violate justice and right, enter your protest in time, then watch the outcome and *remember* it if your congressman or representative is on the wrong side of the question.

The children of the world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. We may gain many valuable points from our friend, the enemy, in running our affairs.

You Catholic men have a solemn duty to perform for God, for home and country. Wrongs must be righted, else a storm will overtake us and will sweep this country into anarchy and chaos.

XIX. The True Position of Labor

Socialism, in order to present a most glaring picture of want and misery, poverty and crime, will divide the world into two hostile camps. On the one side it places Capital, on the other, Labor. Capital it pictures as wallowing in unearned wealth and luxury, meaning that the idle, heartless rich, though few in number, control the entire world, while all others are the slaves of this plutocracy. The laboring man is nothing but a wage slave, earning a pittance. Hence the two classes are pitted against one another: here the rich who earn nothing and have everything, there the laboring man, the "proletariate," producing all wealth and yet possessing nothing. Such a ghastly picture is not a true picture of life as we find it.

If there are only these two classes, in which class must we place the farmer, who owns and works his own farm? He is not a wage slave, for he owns the farm and is his own master. He cannot be classified as belonging to the idle rich, because he works from sunrise to sundown. To which of these classes will the butcher, the grocer, and the many other owners of small retail stores belong? They own their little stores, and the stock they contain, but they do not appear to belong to the idle rich, for one finds them at their stores day after day, working as hard as the farmer. They cannot be called wage slaves because they work for themselves.

If we look at the world as it really is, we shall find three classes of people instead of two. We find a middle class between the two which socialism pictures to us in such ghastly colors. Nor is this all. In real life we fail to find that hatred and class struggle of which socialistic literature treats so insistently. In truth, capital

and labor are dependent upon one another. Neither can succeed without the other, while the great middle class forms the connecting link between the two.

Real life shows us still another fact in this connection. We see how laboring men, by thrift and enterprise, work their way up to the middle class. We see how people of the middle class, again by thrift and enterprise, work their way up to wealth and independence. We also see occasionally how people of the highest class sink down to the lowest. Dissipation and idleness have made beggars of rich men. A section man on a railroad will not have to remain a section man all his life. Opportunities are there for him to work his way up, provided he shows the proper spirit. The careers of Grant, Lincoln and Garfield bring out this point. Nor is a rich man secure in the possession of his wealth. Poor investments will lead to disaster; dissipation and idleness result in ruin.

From this you will see that the classification of socialism is not correct. As we intend to discuss the duties of the state and of capital in the following conferences, we will to-day consider the true position of labor. We desire a true picture of labor, not the socialistic caricature.

Labor is not the slave of capital. If anything it is the superior of capital. One is necessary for the other's success. Without capital there could be no paying labor, without labor there could be no capital. One must help the other and upon that condition only can both attain their happiness. Work remains work whether it be done with head or hand. He who sees disgrace in either is himself worthless.

To place human labor on a level with that of the beast or a machine, is an insult to both God and man. Man is infinitely higher than a beast or a machine, because he has been created to the image

and likeness of God. Whether a man be the poorest of the poor or the equal of kings, he is a child of God the Father and a brother to all men through Christ Jesus, Our Lord. The dignity of labor is as great as the dignity of man.

Since labor is no disgrace the poorest laboring man has the same right as the wealthiest to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The rights of the wealthiest man on earth are no greater than the rights of the poorest men. What then is to be said of an employer who gives his employees starvation wages, who uses the scarcity of work to unrightfully withhold proper pay from labor? What is to be said of corporations that at the end of the year declare a fat dividend while its employees receive hardly enough to live. All that can be said of such corporations and employers is that they are guilty of a crime against God and man. They are guilty of plain theft and should go to prison for it. To take advantage of a weaker or poorer man is always the act of a coward. The brutal sport of the prize fighter is cleaner than are the business methods of many prominent business men. The managers of prize fights classify men into various grades. Under no condition will they permit a fight between men not evenly matched. If only that much honesty prevailed in business there would be little room for unfair dealings.

Corporations claim the right of uniting forces for the purpose of facilitating trade, for cutting down needless expenses, for expanding trade to foreign countries, and so on. If such combinations do not injure the small shopkeepers, manufacturers, and the laboring man, no valid objection can be had against them. Yet, strange to say, these combinations of wealth object often vehemently against labor making use of the same right of uniting in labor unions.

A single laborer could do very little in the way of protesting

against an unlawful act of a united monopoly. But if labor unites also in a federation, it will have the power to push its lawful claims.

Since human nature ever remains the same, the abuse of organization is found with labor as it is with capital. Whereas capital controls the greater amount of money, unions control the greater amount of physical force. Both money and force must be kept in control. Both are like fire: a blessing, when kept within bounds, a calamity when beyond control.

Labor unions must be constantly on guard lest an element of malcontents, who join the union for no proper purpose, get the upper hand. It has happened that labor leaders desired a strike for their personal benefit, and secretly sent agitators among the laboring men who had so far been contented with conditions. The agitators found fault with everything until the laborers came to think that they had a grievance, and a strike was declared for the greater honor and profit of strike leaders. Needless to say the agitators must be paid and their pay comes out of the pockets of the laboring man.

Unions make a mistake if they prefer quantity to quality. The union card and the union label should stand for the highest workmanship. If it does, there will be no longer any question as to which labor is to be employed. If a union wishes all members of a trade to join the ranks it should have a graded standard of workmanship. At the head of each union there ought to be a board of examiners who will classify workmen into grades, and fix a certain scale of wages for each grade. To have two men working side by side for the same wages, one of whom is an expert mechanic while the other is incapable of good work, kills all ambition and is against justice. If classified into grades the mechanic who is in the lower

grade will endeavor to work his way up to a higher grade because he is sure of better wages if able to turn out a better class of work.

Every man has his rights. The poorest of the poor, the man of limited means, without skill and education, has as much right to life and liberty, a home and family, and the pursuit of happiness, as has his wealthy brother who writes his fortune in seven or more figures.

Labor has the right to claim a just wage; a wage that will make it possible to the laborer to live decently and to provide for his family, a wage that will leave him enough to spend the days of his old age in reasonable comfort. The laborer, whether skilled or unskilled, has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That does not mean that skilled and unskilled labor should receive the same wages. Each should be paid according to its worth. Neither does it mean that only skilled labor is entitled to a fair wage, but that unskilled labor cannot claim more than a mere existence from hand to mouth, or worse.

The lowest wage a man may get should be ample to supply all his reasonable wants. It should be enough to feed, shelter and clothe himself and his family. The wages should yield enough to tide him over the days when he is out of work, or when sickness or death enters his family, and to enable him to lay something aside for his old age, and to provide a little as a start for his children, that their beginning in life may be more auspicious than was his own start in life. To all this the lowliest of men is entitled, and the social question that now receives so much attention will find its solution only then, when it is settled according to the just demands of every man.

against an unlawful act of a united monopoly. But if labor unites also in a federation, it will have the power to push its lawful claims.

Since human nature ever remains the same, the abuse of organization is found with labor as it is with capital. Whereas capital controls the greater amount of money, unions control the greater amount of physical force. Both money and force must be kept in control. Both are like fire: a blessing, when kept within bounds, a calamity when beyond control.

Labor unions must be constantly on guard lest an element of malcontents, who join the union for no proper purpose, get the upper hand. It has happened that labor leaders desired a strike for their personal benefit, and secretly sent agitators among the laboring men who had so far been contented with conditions. The agitators found fault with everything until the laborers came to think that they had a grievance, and a strike was declared for the greater honor and profit of strike leaders. Needless to say the agitators must be paid and their pay comes out of the pockets of the laboring man.

Unions make a mistake if they prefer quantity to quality. The union card and the union label should stand for the highest workmanship. If it does, there will be no longer any question as to which labor is to be employed. If a union wishes all members of a trade to join the ranks it should have a graded standard of workmanship. At the head of each union there ought to be a board of examiners who will classify workmen into grades, and fix a certain scale of wages for each grade. To have two men working side by side for the same wages, one of whom is an expert mechanic while the other is incapable of good work, kills all ambition and is against justice. If classified into grades the mechanic who is in the lower

grade will endeavor to work his way up to a higher grade because he is sure of better wages if able to turn out a better class of work.

Every man has his rights. The poorest of the poor, the man of limited means, without skill and education, has as much right to life and liberty, a home and family, and the pursuit of happiness, as has his wealthy brother who writes his fortune in seven or more figures.

Labor has the right to claim a just wage; a wage that will make it possible to the laborer to live decently and to provide for his family, a wage that will leave him enough to spend the days of his old age in reasonable comfort. The laborer, whether skilled or unskilled, has the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That does not mean that skilled and unskilled labor should receive the same wages. Each should be paid according to its worth. Neither does it mean that only skilled labor is entitled to a fair wage, but that unskilled labor cannot claim more than a mere existence from hand to mouth, or worse.

The lowest wage a man may get should be ample to supply all his reasonable wants. It should be enough to feed, shelter and clothe himself and his family. The wages should yield enough to tide him over the days when he is out of work, or when sickness or death enters his family, and to enable him to lay something aside for his old age, and to provide a little as a start for his children, that their beginning in life may be more auspicious than was his own start in life. To all this the lowliest of men is entitled, and the social question that now receives so much attention will find its solution only then, when it is settled according to the just demands of every man.

XX. Duties of the State

So utterly did Louis XIV. of France misunderstand his position and his responsibility, that he was accustomed to say: "I am the State." To all appearances he was fully convinced that the people of France existed only to watch him eat and drink and be merry, and to provide the money for all this.

Now, we are not living for the benefit of kings or rulers. Rather do they live to benefit us. The most glorious title of our holy Father the Pope is: Servant of Servants; and that has been the title of the Popes for centuries. Outranking kings and emperors in authority, they call themselves servants of servants because they realize that their lofty position is not for them to gain personal honor and benefit, but to be of service to mankind in temporal as well as in spiritual needs. Men are not made for the State. The State was made for men. Since men depend upon one another, the organization of a body of men into a community was a necessary step. This organization had to have a leader, as every well organized body must have a head. It was the task of such a community or State to defend itself against hostile neighbors, and it had to frame regulations to promote the welfare, safety and prosperity of its members.

As the Church is founded to promote the spiritual welfare of its members, so the State is founded to promote their temporal welfare. The State, then, has the solemn duty to enact just laws; laws that will not favor one group of subjects to the disadvantage of another; laws that will be fair and just to all alike, the rich and the poor, employer and employees. Of late years various States of our country have enacted a number of laws to safeguard the rights of labor. But let us not think that our duty is done with the laws thus

enacted. The fact is that we still have much to learn from older countries, and especially from Germany.

The laws limiting work to eight hours a day, those ordaining the inspection of shops and factories and abolishing "sweat shops," the minimum wage law, the liability act, the laws prohibiting or at least restricting child labor, and laws regulating female labor—all are a step in the right direction. For the sake of inter-state commerce, and for better regulation of contracts and corporations, it would be a great help to the promotion of welfare and justice if all State laws on labor were uniform throughout the country. It is never good policy to have something legal in one State that is illegal in another. That offers a loophole for the law-breaker and renders his conviction difficult.

As to child labor, laws should be enacted in every State to make it a prison offense to employ children in shops or factories. What work children may do before their sixteenth birthday (like helping their parents on farms, and so on) should be so regulated that such occupation will not interfere with their school work nor endanger their health or morals.

Some employers go so far as to claim that in hiring labor their responsibility ends when they pay a stipulated sum of money for a stipulated amount of work. Whether the laborer can decently exist with that amount of money, whether his health and morals are endangered, does not worry such employers. They would quickly change their views if by some chance they themselves would be compelled to work for starvation wages.

Society needs strict laws to govern and safeguard child and female labor.

It is not necessary for every boy and girl to go through high school. The higher course of education should be reserved for

those whose mental equipment fits them for professional careers. This does not mean there is nothing more to learn for the other boys or girls after their eighth grade. Boys who think their future life is to be devoted to some of the mechanical arts should receive a course in manual training. Let others take a course in a business college, studying bookkeeping, commercial law, and kindred branches, to fit themselves for the commercial calling they have in mind. Let girls prepare themselves for their real life work. A further study of arts and sciences may be beneficial for a certain number of girls, but those who do not intend to devote their life to art or science, should not forget to learn the domestic sciences. The science of making a good meal without the most expensive cuts of meats belongs almost to the lost arts and sciences. Although most girls look forward to having a home of their own, they do not prepare themselves properly to qualify for the position at the head of that home. They may know the chemical elements that constitute the egg, but they cannot boil or fry one. They may know the name for stocking in French, Latin, and other living and dead languages, but they are not able to darn one. By all means give an education to the children, but let that education be practical.

Short-sighted people will oppose all education, and rather have children work at as early a period in life as possible. But the gain —if any there is—is only imaginary. Of what use is a blasted life, a premature decrepitude, to society? What strength, what ambition, what courage, can be left in those people at thirty, broken down in health at the time when they should be in the very prime of life? At a tender age, when they should have still played with dolls, when they should have still lived in the fairyland of childhood, they were driven to work in a factory, shop or mine. At twenty they are a burden to themselves, at thirty they become a burden to mankind.

Society foots the bill. Some heartless corporation abuses these unfortunate people. Society is the loser.

Where the employment of child labor interferes with school work, where it endangers health or morals, it should be made a State prison offense.

Then there is the regulation of female labor.

Female labor requires especial legislation, because the vast majority of female employees will some time become mothers of the next generation. Laws governing female labor should be most rigidly enforced, because society will suffer fearful consequences if such laws remain a dead letter.

There should be laws to prescribe the maximum time that females may be allowed to work. Factories, shops, stores and offices, employing female help, should offer reasonable ease and comfort in conformity with the work. Surroundings should be wholesome and regulations regarding sanitation carefully observed. If we lose sight of the reverence we owe to womanhood we will pay a heavy penalty.

Some business houses have set a fine example by providing more comforts for female employees even than the State demands. In such establishments there are special rest rooms, and recreation rooms for girls and women when not on duty. There will be found lunch-rooms where employees can eat a good meal at little cost. There is an emergency hospital for accidents and sudden illnesses.

While such establishments go to considerable expense in maintaining such beneficial equipment, to which they are not obliged by law, no one will venture to say that this money is thrown away. Every true economist will readily see that the efficiency of employees is by such treatment brought to a higher standard. It will mean greater profits to the employer. Nor is this all. The generosity of

the employer will bring forth loyalty. He will not have to continually break in new help. This, too, will be a positive gain. Contented clerks will draw trade and keep it. Humane treatment will be a silent but powerful advertisement.

Such generous treatment of employees should be the normal condition of labor, and laws should be enacted to make such conduct on the part of employer compulsory. Not that the employer should feel that he is being imposed upon. He is not asked to do anything but what will result for him in more profit when the balance is struck. We have for years suffered from shortsightedness in the business world. We sought only for momentary gain. A gain was a gain; whether or not it violated justice or charity never received consideration. Hence the old adage: "Business is business." Business enterprise must have justice as a foundation, or it will spell ruin in the years to come.

Hence, you, Catholic men, be not found napping at your post of duty. Study the needs of labor, watch the framing of the laws that are to render justice to labor and capital alike. Instruct your representatives as to your wants in labor legislation. If those whom you entrust with the framing of the laws prove untrue to their trust, oust them at the next election, put in men who will act as your faithful servants, and when proper laws are enacted see to it that they are enforced.

XXI. Minimum Wage

Since the State has the duty of promoting the temporal welfare of the people, and since the welfare of the people as a whole depends upon the proper administration of justice, the minimum wage is a matter for the State to decide.

That all citizens may be dealt with justly, the State has the duty of defining a certain amount of wages less than which must not be paid in justice to the laborer and to society. Every man needs a certain amount of money with which to keep up life. He is willing to give for it the labor of his hands, and the State, as the guardian of the rights of man, must see to it that he gets what he deserves. Hence the fixing of a minimum wage is clearly within the province of the State.

The minimum wage does not mean an insufficient wage. Neither the scarcity of work, nor the poverty of laborers, nor their inexperience of laws, should be made the basis of wages, because justice would not be dealt out fairly under such conditions. After all, what good does society reap from unjust wages? Underpaid workers, be they male or female, will quickly realize that they are not getting that to which in justice they are entitled. "Well," they will say, "what we cannot get in one way we will get in another." If they realize that their employers steal from them, they will try and steal from the employers. But stealing from employers is not an easy matter. They can readily invoke the law: if that does not help they can raise the price of products or reduce wages. In either case they are the winners. It should be plain that such things lead to anarchy. Two wrongs can never make one right.

It were well, indeed, if honesty were so deeply imbedded in all employers and in all men that employers would of themselves offer proper wages. With the wane of religion one must be prepared to meet with injustice. It would, indeed, be ideal if people were just and fair from an innate goodness of heart, from a strong desire to abide by the laws of God. But since such ideal conditions are not our real conditions, the State, as the preserver of rights, must step in and arrange for justice to all.

The State, then, must define the sufficient wages for all workers, male and female, for apprentices and for those who are efficient in their work, for skilled and unskilled labor, in order to have all men be dealt with justly.

Much might be said here regarding female labor.

While it is true that some mechanical work can be easily done by females, there is now much work done by them which requires the strength of muscle of a man. And yet these female employees are paid only about half the amount of that given to men. For that reason firms will employ female help in order to swell the dividends. But work is work. When female employees perform the work of men they should receive the wages of men. When we go to factories and there see women receiving only three dollars and fifty cents a week for their work we see the necessity of the State stepping in and ordering a minimum wage. Can such girls and women live decently, clothe themselves becomingly, for such an amount? Of course, it will be alleged that the work does not require skill, and hence cannot claim more pay. This may be correct or not. But in a number of such factories a girl earning three and a half dollars a week for unskilled labor, will have to work for from three to six months, without receiving any wages, if she wants to become competent to do skilled labor. How can a girl with such

small wages save enough to be able to work three or six months without wages? Has society and the State no obligation towards such poor girls?

There are employers who will not engage girls unless the girls live with their parents. But all girls are not so fortunate. What about the girls who have been deprived of home? They have a right to earn an honest living. If death has taken their parents from them it does not follow that they should become slaves. We have institutions where such girls will find a home, where board and lodging is given at the actual cost. While such a noble work is indeed praiseworthy, it is, after all, not so much charity that is desired but simple justice.

According to the books written in this country we are the most enlightened, the most advanced, the most civilized people on the face of the earth. Be this as it may, we will very likely find in English, French and German books similar reading matter in favor of those countries. But all boast of superior civilization will be idle talk if we are callous to injustice that should and must be remedied. Water will not rise above its level. The happiness and prosperity of a land must be measured by the happiness of the lowliest of its citizens.

For that reason employers and employees should come to an understanding about the amount of a living wage for the various kinds of labor. Wages should be graded so that even unskilled labor is put in a position to enjoy the ordinary comforts of life. The result of this agreement between employers and employees should become a law regulating the minimum wage.

Here, however, we come upon a great difficulty.

The experience of the past has taught us that whenever a raise in wages was put in force, or when raw material went up in price,

the ultimate consumer was made to pay the bill. When a coal strike was settled some years ago, the miners were given something like a ten-cents raise in wages for a ton of coal. Then the consumer was raised a dollar for that same ton. The striking miners were given a raise at the expense of the public. Heretofore a raise in expense of production was simply added to the cost the consumer had to meet. The employer kept the same undue percentage of profit or even more. The question arises: "Who is to pay the difference if the State should enforce a minimum wage that would be, say ten per cent., higher than wages were before?"

This ten per cent. of greater cost should be shared by the employer, the middle man and the ultimate consumer. It would be unjust to place the entire burden upon any one of the three. The ultimate consumer will not complain about his share of the burden when he knows that the employer and the middle man also bear their share.

The next question that comes up is to know who will apportion the shares of the greater expense caused by a minimum wage, so that these three parties bear each its just share? In this matter the authority of the State seems to be the competent one to say what ratio of expense is to be borne by the employer, the middle man and the ultimate consumer.

There may be those who fear that such a power of the State would lead to state ownership, first of public utilities and finally of private utilities, and then to State Socialism. But such fears are without foundation. Nearly all States have regulated freight and passenger rates. When the States ordered a two-cent rate for passenger fare, a cry went up from many railroads that this rate would lead to bankruptcy and confiscation of privately owned property. Legal talent was employed to fight the measure, but the right

of the State in determining passenger and freight rates was upheld. And it is now admitted that this action of the States was not only just and proper, but beneficial to railroads and people alike.

In order that the State may know how to divide the burden of the increased wages of a minimum scale, it will have to know the exact business standing of a firm, its exact expense, indebtedness, its exact value, and so on. Corporations whose deals are not always above board, whose valuation contains an over-supply of watered stock, will naturally dislike the idea of the State demanding to know their exact standing. Honest business will have no fear of the light. The firm that dreads investigation needs it the most. The corporations that most vehemently fought the passing of pure food laws were the very ones who made such laws a necessity.

From this it will be apparent that the State in passing a law for a minimum wage will have to have an insight into all business, in order that the extra cost of production might be justly divided between the parties. The State will then be able to define the exact share of the burden which the employer, the middle man and the consumer will have to bear in order to make a minimum wage law just and effective.

XXII. The Liability Act and Old Age Pensions

In figuring profit and loss, employers carefully note the original value of all machinery, buildings and equipment of a factory. They will know almost to a penny how much a machine, a building, or its equipment will depreciate in value and efficiency with each year. Employers will know how long a machine will last, they know the amount of repairs it will require, and when it will have to be replaced by a new machine. The extent of this annual loss through depreciation and wear and tear is added to the maintaining account of the factory, and when the time arrives for the purchase of the new machine the outlay has been fully anticipated and provided for.

This is business. No man is in business merely for his health, nor can any one for that matter expect that a firm furnish buildings, machinery and tools of all sorts as a donation to society. Capital furnishes money and opportunities for labor, but it expects a return for every cent it invests. Since capital is justified in asking a return on every cent it invests, labor is equally justified in expecting a just return for its services. What is right for the one must be equally right for the other. Why should labor donate part of its work if capital is so exact in figuring its demands? Yet it is here where a difference of opinion arises. While the employer carefully notes the gradual wear of his machines, buildings and equipment, and is permitted to reimburse himself for such loss, a similar right is denied to the laboring man. No one thinks of allowing the laboring man a special compensation for the wear and tear of body and strength.

In working for an employer the laborer gives the best he possesses. He puts into his labor his strength and health. He often risks his life in the performance of his duties without giving the matter more than passing thought. His one aim in securing work, even of a hazardous character, is to supply the wants of himself and his family. His toil represents the achievement of his best years. No sooner do the first white hairs show on his temples than up goes the cry of "efficiency!" He is no longer able to turn out the work of his younger years, and he is discharged. A younger man gets his place, only to meet the same fate when his time comes. Such is the mania for "efficiency." Does the discharging of a man who has given an employer the best of his health and strength, satisfy simple justice? If the employer claims the right to reimburse himself for a worn-out machine, has the laborer any less the right to consider the wear and tear of his muscle as a matter for compensation? We cannot say "yes" to the one and "no" to the other. Whatever is a just demand of the one must be a just demand of the other. Simple justice would suggest that the laboring man has even a more sacred right to compensation for his wear and tear because, unlike the machine, he is a human being. It may be urged that, because man is a reasoning being, he should have the common sense to provide for himself by practising economy. At the present time, however, many might be willing to practice economy and not accomplish very much unless they are willing to starve. True, we may cite many cases of extravagance in every community, but that does not prove that *all* people are extravagant. Again, some few may be able to put aside a penny for a rainy day, but there are many more who in spite of all endeavors at economy never succeed in putting money aside, because sickness among members of their family, the necessity of supporting old and helpless parents, impor-

tunities of poor relatives, or unfortunate investments, render it impossible. It is the fight against such bitter odds that makes life one long struggle for existence. All those who will fight this good fight, and lead honorable and upright lives, are greater heroes than those who gain laurels on the field of battle.

The suggestion to practice economy does not answer the demands of justice. Labor is entitled to something more than the actual pay for its work.

It is true, we see individual efforts among firms and corporations to give their employees something more than wages. Some firms operate hospitals in which employees are given free treatment. Other firms will of their own accord pension employees who have been injured in the performance of their work. Other firms, principally railroad companies, will pension their men after years of faithful service. Nor do we hear that any such generous corporations are on that account in the hands of receivers. Their business thrives and they are able to declare handsome dividends at the end of the year. These firms who have practically solved the liability question and provide old age pensions for their employees, are not asking charity from any one. The treatment they accord their employees must pay in more than one way, else it would have been loudly decried as a dismal failure. If then some firms can manage to be just and fair to their help, the question arises why cannot the rest of employers do so? They could if they were compelled. It remains therefore for the state to enact proper laws in protection of labor and to enforce these laws without fear or favor. Firms and corporations that do not render full justice to labor should not be in the market for labor.

There are shops, factories and mines, where life is at risk. Only necessity drives people to apply there for positions. They realize

the danger of the work, the meagerness of the pay, but they gamble with death, hoping to be the one lucky one out of ten who will not get hurt in that work.

A liability law rightously enforced would close up many of these death traps. To place the blame of accidents in shops and mines upon the employees is unjust. Life is just as dear and precious to the poor man as to the millionaire. The rich man may have his cares and responsibilities, but for the poor man the providing for his children, the love of home are just as important as the affairs of a rich man. Accidents are traced less to carelessness of employees than to the lack of safety devices which employers neglect because their installation would cause additional expense. That would violate the fine business rule of cutting expenses to increase the dividends.

A number of our states have enacted liability laws, making employers responsible for any accident that may occur in their plants. By this act the employer must pension or recompense the laborer for any injury he has suffered in the work. In case of death the widow and family receive a pension. Wherever such a liability act is in force the number of accidents has grown less. That is proof that employees are not chiefly responsible for accidents. One must not be rich to love life.

To be just, both, to the employer and the employee, the state should fix a certain amount for injury or death, just as accident insurance companies fix these rates. Unless local conditions should call for special arrangements, care should be taken to make the liability act uniform throughout the union.

It depends upon you to watch over all legislation that affects labor. See to it that, wherever no such act exists at the present,

it may soon be entered upon the statute books, and also that it be enforced to the letter.

Still another step for welfare might be taken by our country, and that is a system of pensioning old age.

In countries where such a law is now operative, both employer and employee contribute a share. The one gives a share of his profits, the other a share of his wages. The fund so created is supervised by the state as are banks and insurance companies. When a laborer has reached the age limit, he receives a pension proportionate to the amount of the share his wages have contributed.

Such a system of pensioning would give help where and when it is most needed. It would of course not provide for the tramp, the hobo, the shiftless jack of all trades. It would bar them who cannot get work owing to intemperate habits, but it would reward industry and faithfulness. The faithful and industrious laborer would realize that the better his work, and the greater the profit of the employer, so much the more handsome the pension he will get in his declining years. He could give more thought to his labor because he need not worry about old age. A law providing old age pension would be the one great means of bringing capital and labor to better understanding of their mutual dependence upon each other. They would understand that the greater profit of the one will mean the better care for the other, the disaster of the one would cause the suffering of the other. There could be no room for misunderstandings or class hatred, if labor received all to which it is entitled.

Let us hope that time will bring about such a blessed state of things. True, it will require years of patient study, a thorough understanding of the relative positions of capital and labor, and of their dependence upon each other, and an ever deepening sense of

justice before such legislation can be enacted in this country. But the fact that other countries have blazed the trail, gives us good reason to hope that eventually justice and right will prevail also among us. It depends after all upon ourselves to accomplish the framing of laws that are just and fair to all.

XXIII. Compulsory Arbitration

For years and years the world has witnessed strike after strike among the laboring classes. Our country is not the only one where such unrest is manifest. Strikes are the order of the day in every country. Hardly is a strike over in one place, when another strike is declared somewhere, and the experience is repeated again and again.

We know from the science of medicine that fever is not a disease by itself, strictly speaking, but the symptom of a serious disorder. It would be folly to check only the fever; the physician must seek the cause of the fever. If the cause is removed the fever will subside of itself. Like a cough, the fever is a danger signal that should warn us of a disorder in our system. In a similar manner a strike is only a symptom. We must look for the cause of the strike, and if we can remedy that cause strikes will disappear of themselves.

There are strikes and strikes.

There are strikes that in some way seem to be engineered by the employers for some object desired by them. Then there are strikes caused by a plain injustice of employers. In such instances the public will be on the side of the strikers, and it will demand that there shall be fair play. There are strikes, on the other hand, in regard to which public opinion is *not* positively in favor of the strikers. The press and public men will in such instances hesitate to commit themselves one way or the other, and while there may be voices here and there in favor of the strike, there are more who doubt the sincerity of the strike leaders; and then there are the

strikes obviously arranged for the benefit of professional strike leaders who can make an easier living by agitation than by the honest work of their hands. So, there are strikes and strikes. Some people are in favor of strikes under all conditions, and others are opposed to them under all conditions. A proper view of strikes lies between these two extremes, and we must admit that there are weighty reasons for at least some strikes. Conditions should be such, however, that things should never reach a point where a strike is inevitable.

At best a strike is a two-edged sword. It cuts both ways. In fact, not only does it in all probability hurt both employer and employee, it injures a third, disinterested, party, namely the public at large. You might not have any objections if Smith and Brown are resolved to have a fight; you might even think it best to let them fight out their grievances among themselves. But when they put you between themselves, and make you a target for their blows, you will strenuously object to such action.

A strike may have ever so just an aim; the right may be on the side of labor, and public opinion may side strongly with labor, but if the strike lasts for more than a week, industry in general will begin to suffer. If it is a coal strike it will not take long before factories must shut down, trains can not run on schedule time because of the shortage of coal; shops and stores will have to close and countless families will be without coal. Thousands of people not in the slightest degree interested in the strike are made to suffer when miners are at odds with their employers, and stop work. Thousands of other workers are thrown out of work, not because they have any grievances, but because there is no coal to fire the boilers. When people are out of work they soon will be out of money. Grocers, butchers and other merchants will have to

extend credit when money becomes scarce, as it does during a strike of great importance, and soon you have a universal stagnation because a few hundred men are at odds with their employers. For a few hundred men on a strike, hundreds of thousands are made to suffer innocently. Surely no one can see any justice in such a situation. Yet there are strikes that last for months and months, that cripple every industry, that bring about even the shedding of blood, and the country stands by helplessly. Legal authorities tell us we have no laws to remedy such a state of affairs, state legislatures will quibble over technicalities, Congress will order an investigation, the outcome of which will never be known by the present generation, presidents will appoint commissions to make an exhaustive report, state militias will clash with labor, and so on. Our authorities appear to be in the position of Sam Wiggins, who played the fiddle at a country dance. When the dance was in full swing a fight was started in which nearly everybody took part, except Sam. After the fight was over he was observed to come from under cover, and he said: "It is a lucky thing I had to hold my fiddle. If it wasn't for that, I would have whipped the whole crowd." Uncle Sam is by no means afraid of anybody, and is always able to give a good account of himself. But at times he is too busy holding the fiddle of politics, and that prevents him from interfering with a strong hand. He would get plenty of help from all right-minded people and would gain the respect of those who would deservedly feel his heavy fist.

When two parties disagree beyond prospect of settlement, and the interests of a third, neutral, party are endangered, some one stronger than the two must step in to settle the difficulty. To define questions of fact or of law we have our courts. It is through our courts that the state shows its strong arm.

Let us suppose that Mr. Black and Mr. White have a dispute about their fence line. Each one claims the fence is on his property. Will it be right or necessary for them to come to blows about it? The superior physical strength of one or the other will never decide where the line should be in justice to both. The only competent authority to decide the dispute is the court. The court will find which one of the claimants is right and which is wrong. The court will order an official survey, and that will promptly end the discussion. No need of quarrelling, no need of coming to blows, no need of a lifelong feud.

But suppose that White and Black do not go to court. They permit the trouble to go on for years and years, they enlist their families, their relatives, their neighbors, as partisans of this feud, and perhaps even furnish them with arms. And then there is a fearful but wholly foolish and unnecessary state of affairs. But how long, do you think, would a county or a state stand by idly and permit such hostilities? White and Black would be held responsible for the furnishing of arms and would be held responsible for every outrage committed. The state would say: We have our courts that decide right and wrong, and it is unlawful for you to fight in such manner.

In the case of White and Black battling over their fence line, they are made to submit to compulsory arbitration by the court. Strange that it should be different when employees and employers have serious or even bloody quarrels.

A strike is declared and the state says it has no laws that could be applied. Why not, then, make laws, if there are none to cover this field. Why should the laws be able to deal with individuals and not with corporations. Is a murder merely a misdemeanor when a corporation is guilty of it? Is theft a crime if Jones is

found guilty of it, and merely a business transaction if a corporation is committing it?

If a corporation is intelligent enough to form business policies, to conduct vast establishments with great success, and to divide profits at the end of the year, it certainly should be held responsible if it does wrong. At the present time people with money to invest buy shares in a successful corporation. No questions are asked whether the money of the corporation is earned in a proper and lawful manner. All that these people desire to know is whether the dividends are large. How they are obtained does not worry them.

What would be the result, however, if stockholders were made responsible for the entire activity of the company whose stocks they hold? Of course, they would closely watch the directors and officers of that company. The election of officials and directors would not be a formality but would be regarded as an important matter. If there were a law that holds stockholders liable to a fine if their particular corporation be found guilty of dishonest dealing, and if officers and directors of a corporation were by law held personally responsible for their doings in office, with a term in prison as the penalty of wrong-doing in office, they surely would not be as many grievances against big business as now there are. The present inability of fixing the blame where it really belongs, makes big business bold to resort to any scheme for the increase of dividends. There should be a law that would place officers and directors of any corporation or stock company behind the prison bars if they became guilty of dishonest work. There should in addition be a fine for stockholders in such cases, as silent partners of wrong-doing. If such laws were enacted there would be no opportunity for strikes based upon the just claims of labor. There might

be strikes declared for speculative purposes rather than for a real just cause. But even these strikes would be made impossible by enacting a law for compulsory arbitration.

A person that fears investigation turns by that very fact suspicion towards himself. And the technical difficulties put in the way of compulsory arbitration are only intended to shield wrong practices and should arouse suspicion and induce investigation.

At the present time the settlement of a strike means nothing more than a temporary truce. Usually both parties have exhausted their resources, and a truce is declared in the shape of a contract that is to expire after two or more years. No sooner does the contract expire than another strike is in order. One can easily understand that such temporary truces can never be a good remedy for strikes.

To prevent the losses of all kinds, which follow a strike as surely as the shadow follows the substance, to prevent lawlessness and injustice, laws should be enacted that will protect the rights of capital as well as of labor. Each should be kept within its lawful sphere. Whenever differences come up between employers and employees there should be a court in which these differences must be adjusted.

Unless the various states could agree upon uniform laws of compulsory arbitration, it would be far better to have a strong federal law instead of conflicting state laws. There are also many people who consider that state laws can be easily dodged, but who have a wholesome fear of a federal officer and a federal prison.

Arbitration laws might, for instance, provide that if laborers and employers have grievances, each side should appoint two men, the four appointing a fifth. If this committee of five can reach an amicable settlement, their outcome is to be accepted by both parties. If one or the other party refuses to accept the decision of these

five men the entire question is to be left to the court. The court will review the findings of the committee, will call witnesses of both parties, and render a verdict that can be reversed only by the supreme court. The court should have the right to impose fines or imprisonment, or both, for the guilty party and collect the costs of the trial from them.

In the meantime, and while the case is pending, it should be unlawful for the employers to shut down the factory or for the laborers to strike, and after the court's decision, work should have to continue upon the conditions laid down by the court. If an employer, who had lost his case, should decide to shut down for this reason, he should be severely punished by law. If labor should strike after decision has been made by the court, it should be made to feel the very same severity of the law. A contract broken by employer or employee is a breach of the law and should be punished impartially.

Many may claim that an arbitration law such as outlined is too drastic. But neither honest capital nor honest labor will have aught to fear from such a law. Conditions as they exist to-day will not be remedied by half-hearted measures. When conditions arise that threaten the very existence of our country, of law and order, we *must* make use of effective means to stem the tide of anarchy, or we might as well sign the death warrant of our liberties at once. If a law of compulsory arbitration will prevent an unfair employer from robbing his laborers, if it will silence the professional strike leader, if it will prevent labor from following the advice of those who would reduce it to slavery, it will be of greatest service to the state. Compulsory arbitration would be a blessing for society. Honest capital and honest labor have nothing to fear from it. They who fear such a law may be rightly suspected of a guilty conscience.

XXIV. The Duty of Labor

We have up to the present considered the duty of capital to labor, and now, to be just and fair to both sides, we must remember that also labor has duties, and we must explain these duties. Unfortunately this subject is one that is often ignored by those who seek profit in misleading the people, and by people too lazy to do their own thinking and who do not care to be told of the burdens they should bear. Yet it must be admitted in all justice, that if we desire to derive the benefits of the social life, we must also be willing to bear our share of the social burdens. For fear of being misunderstood in this matter we shall consider this duty in its plain, unvarnished truth. No one will have reason to feel concerned unless his conscience accuses him of having refused to assume his full share of the social burden.

A witty man has said that it is not the high cost of living that makes people spend so much money but the cost of high living. This word, said in jest, is full of true meaning.

As a nation, we are, I think, the most extravagant on the face of the earth. Not that any one would want to see the laboring man deprived of the comforts of life and the enjoyment of happiness. But the fact remains that as a nation we are extravagant. The well planted and highly productive forests in Europe compared with the neglected and devastated forests of our own land are but one illustration of our extravagance. We might mention thousands of other such instances in our country. A five-acre farm will support a family of eight or ten in Germany. A forty-acre farm in this country is not expected to meet expenses. The average soil of Ger-

many being inferior to our own soil, why is it that these people can accomplish more with five acres than we with forty? Is there any other answer but that of extravagance, or ignorance?

The laboring man, it is true, has as much right to his share of lawful pleasures and the benefit of life as his more fortunate brother; but neither of them is permitted to become extravagant. The same punishment will overtake both if they do.

To come down to actual facts, how many laboring men there are who spend the better part of their earnings in drink? No reasonable man will wish to deprive the laboring man of his glass of beer. If the rich brother can go to his fashionable club to get his expensive drinks and meals, why should not the poorer brother have his glass of beer in decency? Only a fanatic will think of depriving him of this privilege. But between using this privilege and abusing it, there is a vast difference. It is excess and extravagance that must not be allowed.

Who to-day can distinguish in the matter of dress the daughter of a laboring man from the daughter of a millionaire? No one wants to see a girl in rags; she should be dressed becomingly. That does not mean, however, that she should dress above her station. There is no need of a shop girl, or servant girl trying to outshine Solomon in all his grandeur. That costs money. The really refined girls and women dress plainly and appear to very good advantage, while upstarts and would-be's seek to impress by vulgar extravagance.

Many girls of the present time marry with never an idea about housework or cooking. They can no more prepare a plain meal or darn socks than a wooden Indian can play baseball. Yet, marry they will. In such households the plainest meals will be poorly done and provoke indigestion; the costlier the meat, the more ex-

pensive the cut, the surer the failure. The quantity of meats and vegetables that are spoiled in such a household every week would feed two other families.

These days everybody that wants to be anybody must have an automobile. A small auto like a Ford is not stylish enough. It must be an expensive machine, even though a mortgage must be put on the home; to keep up appearances an expensive machine must be bought.

Go to any town where thousands are out of work. You see people walking the streets in search of work. Let a farmer go to an employment agency in that town to find laborers for the harvesting of his crops. These same men, anxious for work, would feel insulted if asked to come out to the farm to work. What, leave the city and go out on the farm? Never! Such an insult! Is it not strange that some people will rather starve in a town than do profitable work in the country. And yet one of the causes that tends to high prices for foodstuffs is the very lack of them. The towns are steadily growing larger and larger. The growth does not come from the natural increase of the families living in these towns, but from the country homes, where farms are being deserted. That means so many mouths more to feed, and so many hands less to produce the foodstuffs needed in the cities. We have now hundreds of thousands of acres of land lying idle, while the demand for the products of the farm is constantly growing. The demand grows greater, the supply less. Can we ever hope for a reduction of prices when the supply fails to meet the demand?

Go to any theatre or moving picture show, or any park on Sunday. See the crowds going from one show booth in the park to another. Watch the excursion trains, the excursion boats, see the crowds coming from theatres every night, and surging to the various

expensive restaurants and cafés! Does that look like hard times? Yet, we are told these are hard times, for we have men who make a study of figures and facts. But, if we look at the extravagance of fashions and the craze for high living, we fail to see the hard times.

If people could be made to realize that living beyond their income is a mistake, that sooner or later will be fatal, that it leads to certain bankruptcy, there would be little trouble about the social question; it would regulate itself.

After all, life is like a bank. One can not get more out of life than one puts into it. The moment we overdraw our account in our bank we are in debt to the bank, and that debt must be paid before we are allowed to draw again. Extravagance is a debt to the bank of life. We can not draw upon this bank of life for benefits, pleasures or honors, unless we put that much value into our life-bank in the way of labor.

Now, if we draw more from life than we put into it, the result will be that we owe. We are in debt to life and, as in a bank, that debt will have to be paid by somebody. If we should die as debtors, our children will have to pay back and they, you know, have no benefit from the pleasures, honors or benefits, that we took out of life. But the debt is there and that debt has to be paid. Here we have the social situation as it is. Disguise it if you will, call it any name you like, but the fact remains; there is a lawful debt and that debt has to be paid. Life does not care who pays the debt, just so it is paid. Moreover, life is a hard taskmaster; it knows no days of grace, no mercy; it will listen to no excuses. It demands its pound of flesh and collects it. The French revolution of the eighteenth century, our own troublesome times, are fair examples of the way life has of collecting its debts.

For that reason look upon life as upon a bank. Do not draw more from either than you put into them. Draw no more from life than you put into it and there will be no social unrest.

You have often heard how your grandfathers, the early settlers, had to struggle to make ends meet. As a proof of their wisdom, let me say, they put more into life than they drew from it, and the handsome balance that was in their favor at the time of their death, was placed to *your* credit. In those days there were no picture shows, styles did not change every twenty-four hours, and the mad desire for living beyond one's income was unknown. It is true the earnings of these early settlers were little; it is likewise true that they spent even less. No one will deny that prices were low then. But since those days the earning capacity of the laborer has increased four times and more, and, if people lived within their income, it would be as easy to save money to-day as it was fifty years ago.

Unfortunately we live in days that are opposed to true simplicity and economy. Extravagance has become the ruling passion, and so there can never be a way out of the bankruptcy into which society is running, because more coin in the weekly pay envelope just means greater extravagance. The luxuries of yesterday become the necessities of to-day. People who can not make ends meet with an income of a hundred dollars a month, will be even worse off with two hundred dollars a month, because there will be a proportionately greater craving for still greater extravagance, to outshine those others who earn three hundred a month. And so the world runs wildly on in its mad chase. Life plays the waiting game patiently, for it knows that *somebody* will have to pay the bill eventually.

Economy is not a disgrace. Does not your employer economize?

Does he permit any item of expense which he knows is unnecessary? Are not the brains of the country ever busy trying to discover ways and means of lessening the expenses of manufacturing? If the wealthy ones of the world do not consider economy a disgrace, can it be a disgrace for the workingman? A merchant who had begun with nothing but his strong hands told me one day: "Father, it is not what a man earns, but what he can lay aside that counts." Here was a man who worked with both his hands and his brains. Even when he was well-to-do he never overdrew his account in the bank of life. He was far more simple in his dress, taste and so forth than some of his working people. One day he mildly warned one of his clerks about his extravagance. The young man was insulted and threw up his job. He said he did not want to be preached to by any man.

Be as economical and prudent in what you buy as are your more wealthy brethren. Be simple and moderate in all your tastes, and you will find that in the bank of life your balance is on the right side of your ledger.

Another truth the laboring man must bear in mind is that he must do an honest day's work for the honest pay he receives.

Socialistic quacks delight in telling you that the interests of the laboring man and of his employer are as far apart as is west from east. Nothing can be more false. Their interests are in truth identical. Labor and capital are not opposed to each other, or independent of one another, but they are alike and depend upon one another. There can be no labor without capital, nor capital without labor. One needs the other, one depends upon the other. As well one might say that the hands are opposed to the head. What would become of a body if the hands, or the stomach, or the head, went on a strike refusing to perform their functions. The body would

soon become a prey of sickness and death. The social body is exposed to the same danger, when its various members fight among themselves and refuse to perform the functions for which they have been destined.

Bear in mind that your interests are exactly the same as those of your employer, and give him honest work for the honest pay you receive. When work is slack, who is it that is laid off the very first? Not the honest and zealous working man, who is faithful in his work, but the man who does his work in a poor fashion, always fearing that he is doing too much for what he earns. Who is the man that rises to be his own master? Not the man who is afraid of working too much, not the man who shirks his duty, but the man who turns out honest work. You may go to any business you like, you will always find the manager and the owner working the longest. When the employees have gone home, at the first sound of the gong, you will find one or both of these men staying at the office looking over their accounts, studying how they may make a sale of this or that article, consulting with heads of various departments, planning and studying all hours of the night. If the laborers would work as steadily as their masters they would no doubt be better off, too. Working with an eye to the future, understanding that his interests are bound up with the interests of the firm, working in harmony, is one of the ways of making deposits in the bank of life.

We must, then, say that thrift and economy, and the living within one's income, are rules that have to be observed by the laborer as well as by any other man. And honesty in work is the other requisite for harmony. Only when the workingman understands that his own interests are bound up with the interests of his employer, that instead of being opposed to each other they should work to-

gether, when the Golden Rule of Christianity will take the place of greed, will there be true peace and harmony.

My dear men! Look up to good St. Joseph, the model of the workingman. Think of his sorrows and his trials. There in Nazareth, in his humble home, he held within his arms the Christ-child. He understood that the Child he held in his loving embrace was the very Son of the living God, come down upon this earth to redeem the world. And all he could offer the Christ-child was his very humble home, the plainest of clothing, food and shelter. How gladly would he have done more for his divine foster Child, how gladly would he have slaved and starved to give more than he had. Whatever he was able to earn with his calloused hands, in the sweat of his brow, he was willing to give, more he could not. Though St. Joseph was the poorest of the poor, yet we never heard of his being dissatisfied or discouraged. Never was there a happier or a more contented family, nor one more saintly, than that of St. Joseph with Jesus and Mary.

If in our day we could wipe from the face of the earth the taint of extravagance and selfishness, and instead cultivate the simplicity and piety of the holy family, how much better off the world would be for it!

XXV. The Failure of Secular Education

When we consider the present day clamor for education as it is dispensed in our public schools, and then consider its poor results, we have indeed reason to ask ourselves why all this boasting when so little good comes of it. There must evidently be a fault somewhere, or results would be more encouraging. When a judge of a criminal court is constrained to make the sad admission that more than eighty per cent. of criminals coming before him are young men that have scarcely passed their twentieth year, there must be something radically wrong with the system of education for which the people of our country are so generous in praise and support.

Our educators—and with this I mean the spokesmen of our public school system—have the strange notion of wanting to build up character without the help of religion. Indeed, some of the views these educators express might well come from those for whom we care in homes for the feebleminded. To illustrate, one educator advanced the wonderful idea that each class-room should have a pianola, or at least a victrola, to furnish classical music for the pupils. The tuneful strains of Mozart, Wagner, Beethoven and other masters of music are said to exert such a wonderful influence for culture and refinement upon the minds of children that they will crave for nothing but the good and beautiful. The disadvantages of evil surroundings, bad company, even crime, will disappear at once—because these things are *not* beautiful.

How strange that God had to give us His ten Commandments when He could have made matters so much more agreeable by bestowing upon us talking machines or self-playing pianos!

Other educators are equally positive that our public school system will remain ineffective until the children will be given proper public playgrounds. The child, it is alleged, learns mostly by means of games. Owing to the absence of available land around public schools there is not enough space to give the child ample opportunity for games. Hence they seek their play elsewhere, on streets, where they are exposed to the dangers of traffic, or in alleys, where other dangers lurk—bad company and germs of all kinds. Hence the argument in favor of public playgrounds where, under proper supervision and with a complete outfit for all suitable sports, the child can be taught to play its games. Then the welfare of future men and women is assured! Where the appeals of classical music might be wanting, the idea of popular games will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of all children. First of all, they love games, and, secondly, the teachers who will supervise their play will teach them in their games honesty, self-reliance, perseverance, strength of mind, and so forth, the very virtues that will help to mould their character and make them the men and women they should be.

It may be up-to-date to teach morality by means of a game of marbles; yet it is extremely doubtful whether the means are powerful enough to correspond with the object the educators have in view.

At no time did God tell the prophets of old to teach the people the game of tag that they might learn honesty or virtue.

Other educators again see a great harm in the display of tobacco or the proximity of a liquor store, and as a result we have filled our statute books with drastic laws. There are laws forbidding the sale of tobacco to boys, curfew bell ordinances, etc., etc. And yet we might add laws upon laws purporting to benefit the growing generation without accomplishing the least good result. That much,

however, may be considered certain: Where the home influence and proper home training are lacking no amount of laws, be they ever so drastic, provide a substitute for a real good home training. Where parents neglect their duties all laws will be ineffective. The scandalous numbers of youthful criminals ought to make that point clear.

For my part, I must admit that I see nothing but fanaticism, even hypocrisy, in most of the legislation aimed at the proper bringing up of children. Above all, I see in it a tacit admission of modern parents that they are incompetent to bring up their children properly.

When you men were boys was a cigar store ever a source of temptation to you? When we were boys we could pass a hundred tobacco stores without ever being tempted to enter them. Indeed, had we ever attempted to go to a store for a package of cigarettes we would have come into violent contact with a well seasoned strap, or whatever else father had handy, to teach us a solemn lesson. There was no need at our time to draft laws for this and that; we had parents to look out for us. It was not necessary when we were boys to ring a curfew bell. We knew when it was time to be home, and we made it a point to be home by that time. We knew what was coming if we should fail to be home when our parents told us to be home. There was no curfew law necessary.

In homes where religion is a thing unknown, and, alas, we have many such in our fair land, a proper bringing up of children will be an absolute impossibility.

But then there are other educators who see the only salvation in the inculcation of "ethics." What this word really means they have not quite decided; but, at any rate, it is a fine sounding word, and that goes far with people who dislike to do their own thinking. Any good-sounding phrase will do, if only religion is kept out.

We know of "ethics" in the medical and legal profession, and we might as well have "ethics" doing its share for education!

It is passing strange that people who claim to know a great deal about everything can not understand that religion and morality are two things that are inseparable as cause and effect. And yet we find educators advancing nonsensical theories and schemes to perfect education without any religion, as though talking machines, self-playing pianos, playgrounds, drastic legislation and "ethics" could take the place of the true morality that can be built on the lasting basis of religion.

Nor can we say that these educators are ignorant. Their courses of study and observation must have taught them valuable lessons. If we wish to understand their fallacies we must conclude that there is a studied effort on part of these educators to banish all religion from the hearts of the growing generation. There is a conspiracy to push God out of the world.

There are two facts that must be obvious: The mere ability to read and write and figure can not make the scholar good or virtuous. We have at the present time more educated than uneducated criminals. The knowledge of right does by no means compel us to do right.

The other fact is that the majority of our criminals are those who have had, if not all, at least the greater part of the benefits that up-to-date education affords to pupils of our public schools. If, then, all these theories of our so-called educators are so ineffective, is it not high time to look for other methods, such as will be productive of better results?

To hide the cloven foot, there are those who demand that the Bible, "the rule of life," should be read in public schools. If the

growing generation will only "read" the Bible, virtue will be triumphant!

But, let me ask, what good will the mere "reading" of the Bible do?

Let us suppose that the Bible could be revised in such a fashion that all denominations, from Jews to Christian Scientist, would be suited, what would follow? Why, only this: that we can dispense with teachers entirely. If mere reading will produce such wonderful results, give books to the children and it will not even be necessary to erect school buildings. But why do we engage teachers in our schools? The teachers have the duty of *explaining* the books. The child will stumble over phrases, the meaning of which must be explained before he can form a definite idea. The teacher must prescribe certain tasks, must correct mistakes and direct the studies of the child. And the child will learn only that which the teacher is really able to make clear to his dawning intelligence.

Can it really be possible that there are people so hopelessly dense as to think that the mere reading of even the most sacred book will suffice when we have to have competent and experienced teachers to explain the simple spelling book to the child?

Truly the world has become mad when it tries to foist upon us a system of education from which God is to be left out. A system of education that leaves out God may successfully teach grammar and algebra; it will never successfully teach morality.

man—religion. Not even the "reading" of the Bible can exert that power, because this holy book needs to be explained by one who has studied it, like the text-book of any other science.

Here, then, is the reason why we Catholics establish our own schools for the children of our faith.

Let us look at this subject from another angle. Which of the three spiritual faculties is the greatest? At the present time, owing to our perverted idea of education, much is being said in praise of the mind. We admire people for their wonderful achievements in their mastery over the forces of nature; but *is* the mind really the greatest of our faculties? What of the man who has a well trained and strong will? The man who has a strong will and uses that strong will in conformity with the divine laws, by doing what God commands and avoiding what God forbids, because God has made those laws, is a far greater man than he who can read the mysteries of the sky and the secrets of the deep. In all the world there is no sadder sight than that of a brilliant mind that has gone astray; a great mind, dragged down by a poor, weak will. For that reason our public school education, because it utterly neglects the will, is found wanting, and all the frills and innovations a Godless age uses to enhance its Godless system of education only add burdens that bewilder the mind, but they leave the will untouched.

Even considered from a merely worldly aspect, our public school education is a dismal failure, because we expect from it what it is unable to give—a complete or thorough education. Looked at from a spiritual standpoint, the public school education is even more of a failure, because the salvation of our immortal souls does not depend upon brilliancy of mind but upon strength of will. The performance of every act upon which our eternal salvation depends must come from the will, aided by grace. Where the good will is

lacking, meritorious work for heaven will not be undertaken. In that case grace lacks the cooperation of the will, and thus is rejected.

We must then conclude that our much boasted secular education is found wanting, because the all-important faculty of the soul, the will, is utterly neglected.

It is one thing to teach a man to be wise and another to teach him to be good. Wisdom and goodness are not words that mean the same thing. Hence the religious education, that not only enriches mind and memory but also strengthens and moulds the will to act in conformity with the holy Will of God, must be considered the ideal education, the only education that is worth having.

Hence the Catholic Church insists upon a complete education, one that trains all the faculties of the soul equally and uniformly.

The holy Apostles were sent by their Divine Master to "teach" all nations. Mark the words, "teach all nations." It was their God-given task to teach mankind, not so much brilliancy of mind as goodness of will. In apostolic times there were standards of education similar to those of our day. Culture was at its height, but at the same time there was such a general depravity of morals that mankind was reduced to the level of the beast. To this degraded humanity Christ sent His Apostles as "teachers." "Teach ye all nations," was His Divine command. The Apostles were the real teachers of mankind for all ages to come. They did not set about starting schools for languages, the arts, or sciences, yet they were truly teachers. Guided by the light of the Holy Ghost, who was to teach them all truth, they set about, not to make people brilliant according to worldly standards, but to lead and train their wills and thus to make them good.

And now, the same as in those apostolic days, we find the world

opposed to the real teaching of Christ. The world puts up an elaborate system of education, adding new devices and new methods every year, and yet it has to admit its utter failure when it begins to compare efforts with results, and theories with facts. The world knows perfectly well that religion is the only power that can successfully form and direct the will of man, but it purposely neglects to make use of that power because seeing it does not see, and hearing it does not hear. To-day, as then, it would never do for the world to acknowledge its error; it must persevere in wilful blindness in its antagonism to Christ, no matter how unreasonable or even disastrous its attitude may be.

XXVII. The Catholic Taxpayer and the Public School

The position of the Catholic taxpayer who sends his children to a Catholic school is difficult and at times annoying. His money is taken without objection; but when he expresses his intention of taking part in a school election, when he voices dissatisfaction regarding the spending of money, or, when he even seeks a place on the school board—then a cry goes up and all fear that with the coming in of Catholic school officials the glorious red brick school house, that has shed so much splendor upon our race, will be in danger of its existence.

When the English, the French and the Italian governments took the property of the Catholic people by confiscating Catholic hospitals, schools, convents and colleges, where was a cry of objection by the public ever heard? On the contrary, the people cheered like maniacs when the poor nuns were driven from their convents! Oh, those were glorious achievements! Look at the crumbling walls of ruined convents and abbeys in England and Ireland; look at the convents and schools of France that have been taken over by the State and now serve purposes foreign to those which their founders and endowers intended. Look at the municipal and State buildings throughout Italy! The most of them were formerly convents, hospitals or schools. It is an easy matter for a State to confiscate endowments, to take forcible possession of Church property. And where did ever a nation protest against such unlawful action? Why, these countries are praised for their enlightened action, and the robbers are called eminent statesmen. Why should words be wasted over such a trifling matter? It was only Catholic Church property that was sacked; what is the difference? If the Italian government

had confiscated the endowment of a Baptist or Methodist college, there would have been a riot; but it was only Catholic Church property, and nowhere was a protest uttered, except by the Catholics themselves, and they were ignored.

I understand that the policy of anti-Catholic countries of Europe is not the policy of our own country; yet it requires no prophet to say that, if such confiscation were ever undertaken right here, the number of those who would approve of this action would by no means be a minority.

That the Catholic Church would ever desire to destroy or confiscate the property of our public schools is an idea that can only originate in the brain of the insane or in the head of a fanatical bigot.

Nevertheless, Catholics are told that because they are opposed to the educational system of our public schools they should not presume to take any part in their management.

Let us see what answer may be given to this assertion.

It is true that Catholics must be dissatisfied with a system of education that does not give to religion the place it deserves. We have instructors for football and baseball and athletics, but the most important part of education, religion, is ignored. What the soul is to the body that religion is to education. As the body is dead without the soul, education without religion is a lifeless thing. As the soul can live without the body, so can religion exist even without education. But there cannot be a correct system of education without religion. This is the standpoint of the Catholic Church. The Catholic is not opposed to education as such; on the contrary, he wants the best education that can be had. He is not satisfied with only half an education when he can have a complete education, in which religion is given the prominence it demands.

If the public school education does not come up to the Catholic standard it does not follow that the Catholic voter and taxpayer should be deprived of his rights of citizenship. It is true, the Catholic taxpayers build their own parish schools; but at the same time they pay taxes for the support of the public schools. If our government would see to it that, since Catholics build their own schools and thus save the State millions of dollars each year, they should not be taxed for the support of schools from which they derive no benefit, then it would be highly improper for a Catholic to desire any voice in the affairs of our public schools. But since the State makes the Catholic taxpayer contribute his share of taxes for the support of the public school system, the State must at the same time grant the Catholic taxpayer the right to have his say as to distribution of the school moneys, the right to hold school offices if his fellow citizens deem him worthy of it and to teach in those schools if he can establish his fitness for such a position. Otherwise we are subjected to the tyranny of taxation without representation and the founders of our republic have fought in vain.

Let us consider the position of the Catholic taxpayer in another light. While he pays taxes for the support of the public school system, we see him building schools of his own where his children are being taught, without asking the State a penny for the work. We find Catholic parish schools in every city of the country and even in villages and farming communities. We find that nearly two million children are being educated without calling upon the State for a cent of pay. Catholics save the country millions of dollars every year, for if they had not their own schools, the government would have to put up as many buildings and engage as many teachers as are now included in the Catholic parish school system. Even under present conditions the State has more of a burden than it can

well carry. And if it should have to provide for the additional millions of children of Catholic parents, taxes would have to be raised from thirty to fifty per cent., and school taxes are high enough as it is.

Does it seem fair that the Catholic taxpayer who contributes his share of taxes should be deprived of a fundamental right of citizenship?

There is still another angle from which we may view the school question.

In looking over your tax receipts you may ascertain the amount of taxes you pay for the various city departments. You find you pay so much for fire and police protection, so much for paving, street openings, water, and so on.

Suppose someone would assert that Catholics should not take part in the benefit of police and fire protection because they are Catholics. Would you not say that no matter what you are, or who you are, you are entitled to that protection because you pay your taxes? Who but an idiot, or bigot—which means about the same—would deprive you of your lawful benefits of taxation! If for the taxes you pay you are entitled to your proper share of fire and police protection, for the same reason you are entitled to receive your share of the taxes you pay for schools. Even though in your own schools your children are instructed in your holy faith, they receive at the same time an education in all the arts and sciences taught in public schools. What difference can it make to the State in what schools your children are educated, as long as they are the equals of the corresponding grades of the public school? If your children do learn another branch, over and above the requirements of public school standards, that is the business of nobody but the parents who have the natural right to decide what their

children are to learn. From this viewpoint it must be clear to you that we Catholics are as much entitled to a share of our taxes for educational purposes as we are entitled to our share of benefit from the taxes we pay for fire and police protection.

Catholics have not made a formal demand upon the government for a share of the school taxes, although should they ever do so, they would be perfectly within their rights.

Here, then, you have the position of Catholic voters and taxpayers as to the school question of our country. If ever a bigot should challenge your right to take part in school elections, to seek a school office, or to take a position as teacher, tell him that taxation without representation is tyranny. Tell him there is still another principle he has overlooked in his zeal to cheat Catholics out of their rights and that is the right each man has in this, our country, of serving God according to the dictates of his conscience. Tell him a Catholic is really entitled to *two* votes in matters of education, because he contributes more for the support of our public schools than voters whose children are educated by the State, because the Catholic voter not only pays school taxes, but saves the State much money by relieving it of the education of his children.

I wish to impress upon you the solemn duty to take part in every election that takes place. Take a lively interest in all things that concern the welfare of your town, or city, or State. Exercise your right and ask no odds from any man. Perform your duties as good American citizens, but put in first place your duty to God and to your holy faith.

XXVIII. The Influence of Infidelity Upon Education

In our preceding conferences we have shown how the vice of infidelity has gained a hold upon man, poisoning all his hopes, ambitions and yearnings; a gaunt octopus that reaches out its tentacles upon every political and social aspiration of man. Education has not escaped this far-reaching vice. Nor need we be surprised over this; for when the very sources and fountains of waters have been corrupted, the streams are infected too. The only wonder is that there are thinking men who fear that they, who oppose a Godless education, are a menace to our country, its laws and institutions, whereas, as a matter of fact, our country can face no greater danger than that of a Godless education.

Bigoted papers charge continuously that Catholics who oppose our public school system are thereby the outspoken enemies of the laws and institutions of our land. Catholics are opposed not to education as such, for no other denomination brings such great sacrifices for education, but Catholics are opposed, as every just man must be, to a system of education that leaves God out of its reckoning.

Our temporal welfare as well as our spiritual salvation depends upon God. A people can have neither, when it permits itself to be influenced by the enemies of God. Not the Catholic voter and not the Catholic parish school is the menace of our country. If we wish to discover the agency that undermines our laws and our institutions, we must look to those bigots and infidels who know not God. Then shall we find the real enemy. We have indeed come upon very unhappy times when this enemy of our country can go throughout the length and breadth of the land, like a wolf in sheep's

garb, to proclaim to people that we Catholics, who are willing to shed the last drop of blood for our country, but who render to God the things that are God's, are the cunning enemy of the land. And we find millions of shallow-minded people eager and ready to believe that we Catholics are traitors, while the atheist and infidel pose as saviors of the land. The upholders of laws, human and Divine, are called traitors, while infidelity, the enemy of such laws, boasts of endeavoring to keep this land of ours in glory and power.

On all sides we are told that the public school system of our country is the ideal education all other countries might well copy, and when we are brought face to face with alarming symptoms, as for instance, juvenile delinquency, we are asked to close our eyes to them, and not ascribe them to the real cause—godless education—but to other conditions. Hence refuge is taken behind drastic laws, such as the curfew bell; fads and fancies of various kinds are introduced from year to year, and their promoters expect that such will stem the tide of juvenile crime. Laws are enacted making it unlawful for storekeepers to sell tobacco to boys. Does that stop boys from smoking? Why not try religious training when all these efforts are in vain. But religion cannot be introduced into our school system, we are told, because that would interfere with freedom of education.

You know, as well as I, that good, pious, home training is absolutely essential for the proper bringing up of children. Your boys may pass by all the saloons without ever being tempted to enter one of them. If they do hear profane language or see some boisterous fellow making a fool of himself, they will be impressed the more by what you have told them and see a living proof of the warnings they have heard from you. Your boys will pass cigar stores without being tempted to enter one of them to buy cigarettes. Such is

the force of the proper home training. But what of those children who have not the proper home training? We will be told that hundreds and hundreds of children have not the proper rearing. For such unfortunate children we have courts. The probate courts are resorted to in order to appoint fit guardians for such children. If the only knowledge of child training of some parents consists in bringing children into the world they should never have married. Matrimony certainly is not the vocation of people who are not competent to live up to the sacred duties which this state of life demands. But, if the state finds itself compelled to appoint guardians for some children, it does by no means follow that the state must interfere with the bringing up of all children, including such who have the proper surroundings and competent and well-meaning parents.

According to the present tendency of laws, insofar as they refer to education, one is led to believe that no parents are the proper custodians of their children.

A playground, with official overseers for the games and plays of children, a curfew bell to warn them when they must retire, a policeman to stand before cigar stores and saloons telling them they must not buy either beer or cigarettes, and, behold, the manner of properly bringing up children is rendered so easy that anybody can be a competent parent.

In all seriousness, I think it is high time, indeed, to legislate for parents who fail to understand their solemn duties. There would be no necessity for a curfew bell if parents knew enough to keep their children from the streets at night; there would be no law necessary forbidding the selling of tobacco or beer to children, if parents knew their duty to their children.

Some may say, all this sounds very reasonable, but there are

children who do not mind. The children apparently have no idea what the word obedience really means. Here is the trouble. Why is it that the child has no idea of parental authority? Because in our system of secular and Godless education it is kept ignorant of Divine authority. And why do they not teach in our public schools about Divine authority? Oh, that would be contrary to the principles of religious liberty! Here we have come to the kernel of the educational question. Our infidel age mockingly refers to freedom of conscience, and, claiming to observe the fundamental right, of religious liberty, compels the children to be educated in a manner that must pluck religion from their innocent hearts. Here we have the training of the mind and memory considered to be the very ideal of education, while the training of the will is utterly neglected. Here you have a sample of the hypocrisy of a bigoted and infidel generation, that provides a teacher for the game of tag while it leaves out religion under the plea of freedom of conscience. If ours is a free land for all the people, it should offer equal facilities for all the people and not only a part of them. If people who do not believe in God are enabled to teach their children in a Godless way, we Catholics, by the very same right, ought to be free to teach our children in the religious way. If the state favors an irreligious education for those who believe in no God, why should not the state grant the right of a religious education for those who do believe in God? If the state supports the schools in which no religion is taught, why does it not support schools in which religion is an essential part of education? The reply is ever the same hypocritical and deceitful evasion: "We must not interfere with religious freedom!" In other words, we must leave out all religion from our system of education; we must make atheists of our children in order to uphold the beautiful principle of religious liberty. Re-

ligion must be ignored in order to keep it free. What beautiful reasoning, what profound logic, what sublime truth! Is there a man whose ire does not rise within him when such an hypocritical and deceitful interpretation of the principle of religious freedom is given?

For this reason you, Catholic men, have a solemn and sacred duty to perform, not only for the spiritual welfare of your children, but for the welfare of your land.

The downfall of a country was always preceded by an era of atheism. History has repeated itself so many times that we ought to take this lesson from it. If we fail to apply this lesson to our country, history will be repeated for those who come after us. A nation-wide separation from God means the downfall of that nation. We have already made rapid strides in a national falling away from God, by bolstering up a system of education that rests upon an anti-religious principle. We have permitted generation after generation to graduate from these schools. These graduates know nothing of Divine law or God. We have filled our prisons with youthful criminals. Murder, theft, adultery and robbery are everyday occurrences. "By their fruits ye shall know them." Here are the fruits of the infamous Godless system of public school education.

As faith grows weaker vice spreads. The vices of individuals become the vices of the masses, and under such conditions a country is doomed. The laws of the land will be broken, courts will lose prestige and authority when the laws of God are ignored. With the weakening of authority the last prop that could uphold a people drops away, and anarchy is bound to follow.

The Catholic voter and taxpayer, far from being the enemy of his country, because he insists upon a religious education for his chil-

dren, is the strongest and boldest defender of his country. When bigots and infidels will remove their masks we will know the real enemies. If our country can ever be saved from the destruction for which it is headed through infidelity, the Catholic citizen will be found at his post of duty to try and recall the nation to its God and its salvation.

XXIX. Infidelity in Politics

We cannot be blind to the fact that Protestant churches fail in their task of saving mankind for God. The Reformation, so-called, contains within itself the germ of death. In the first place Protestant denominations lack every vestige of authority. They forfeited this power, that is alone able to hold the minds of men in accord, by declaring a right that was not within their giving, namely, the right to interpret the Sacred Scriptures according to individual taste. Not even our civil laws are left to us to interpret as we like; we have to accept the interpretation of the courts. How then can any man presume to interpret the laws of God according to his individual liking? What right has any man, or any set of men, to take the Word of God and glean from it what seems to them plausible, and leave out what does not appeal to them? By the very fact that man assumes such right he places himself on an equal footing with God, and the proper relationship of Creator and creature, of Lord and servant, is brushed aside. Each man, then, assumes the privilege to interpret the Sacred Scriptures as he likes. Hence Protestant ministers cannot even act in the capacity of advisors, for each one of their listeners has the right of believing what he likes best. So it is that the principle of private judgment has in itself the germ of disintegration, of death. Then, in the second place, Protestantism is practically without Sacraments. It can offer its people no means of grace. Like the Jews of the New Testament, Protestantism has no priesthood, no altar, no sacrifice.

Protestantism pretends to make the Bible the rule of faith, or the rule of life; yet it fails to live up to it whenever it is easier to

do otherwise. What is more, it fails to recognize its inconsistency! It blindly continues to publish Bibles by the million, but fails to abide by what the Bible says. Even now Protestantism is bound to acknowledge that about half of our entire population is of the non-church-going class. Is not this an indication of decay and death?

While thinking people must realize this decay and death of Protestantism, they must at the same time begin to realize that the Catholic Church is constantly increasing its membership. They who fall away from the Protestantism will either go back to the Mother-church, recanting the errors of their forefathers, or they will enter the ranks of those who utterly ignore God.

Of course, it would not do for Protestantism to see into the error of its ways, and yet the tide towards Rome must be stopped at all hazards. What is to be done? Revivals of various kinds are being encouraged and advertised by the daily press, the attendance at Protestant services is made more and more attractive in various ways, by means of polished orators, picture shows, social work and the like, attacks against the Catholic Church find welcome helpers and supporters among their ministers, slanderous papers are printed and sold for almost nothing in which a caricature of the Catholic Church is shown to the people, anti-Catholic secret societies are organized with the one purpose of barring Catholics from holding any office in state, county or city, and a godless education, that drives their own youthful members from their churches, is lauded to the sky as the *ne plus ultra* of our grand and glorious country. Let us ask ourselves whether any or all of these subterfuges can ever be able to perform the twofold task of stopping the leakage in their ranks, and of stemming the progress of the Catholic Church?

At all events, even Protestantism is doubtful of the outcome of

these efforts, and still other tactics must be employed. Considering mankind of the present day, we find that the greater part of it is too indifferent to do its own thinking. It permits others to frame its opinion and idly drifts with the tide. People, instead of using their own judgment, permit themselves to be swayed like reeds in a swamp. Emotion is the great motive of human activity at the present time. Allow some forceful speaker or writer to play upon popular emotion or sentiment, and the country can be even brought to the verge of war. A so-called ex-priest or ex-nun may go throughout the land, from one Protestant church to the other, and incite the people of an entire town to hatred that will continue for years and years, by simply playing upon the emotions. But nothing helps so much to keep emotions at the boiling point, as when one mixes anti-religious agitation with politics. That combination is never known to fail with people who mistake emotion for reason.

The old lie that Catholics cannot be loyal citizens of a country because they owe obedience to a foreign Pope, will not down and, however often the lie may be exposed, there are those whose emotion is more easily reached than their reasoning faculties, and the lie passes for gospel truth. Men and women too lazy to earn their living by honest work, earn an easy living by the work of a lying tongue, and find thousands who gladly part with fifty cents or a dollar to listen to slanders that decency forbids to repeat. So it comes that emotions are everlastingly kept at white heat, and if a Catholic should want to be even constable of a town in which bigotry holds forth he is sure to be defeated. If a town should have a Catholic constable we are told that the Pope of Rome will give him his instructions and then good-bye, liberty!

We boast of a constitution in this country that pledges religious freedom to every man, woman and child. The country recognizes

no state Church, as does England and Russia. Even the Mormons are not molested in the exercise of their religion, provided they observe the laws of the land. All religions are to be considered equal, all people of the country have an equal right to live and to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience. There is only one religion whose loyalty is questioned, and that is the Catholic religion.

There never was a time in the history of our country when Catholics failed to answer to the call of duty, even though the histories that are read in our public schools do not give credit where it belongs. Original documents and fairminded historians can be consulted by all who wish to inform themselves of the truth in this matter. And though even the most bitter enemy of truth cannot find a single instance of disloyalty or treason on the part of Catholic citizens of this country, recourse must be had to lies and slanders. Facts must be perverted and distorted, charges must be invented, and a people that is only too willing to be deceived, swallows all.

That there is a marked tendency in our country to misrepresent the Catholic Church cannot be denied by any man able to read the signs of the times. Why else have we the secret anti-Catholic societies, whose one and only object it is to bar Catholic citizens from holding public office? Why else the fear of telling the truth in matters of history? Why the studied effort of minimizing whatever the Catholic Church has accomplished in behalf of our Union? All is done for the one purpose of picturing the Catholic Church as an intruder, an impostor. Whatever the Catholic Church has done for this country is either ignored, or it is belittled. Consult any of our average text books on history. What is not said about the virtue and integrity of the Pilgrim Fathers! There are scarcely words enough in our language to tell of all their noble qualities.

But what little space is given to the colony of Lord Baltimore, who was the first to proclaim religious freedom? Had Lord Baltimore been a Protestant, and had the Pilgrim Fathers been Catholics, the bigotry of the latter would have been made so disgusting we would not entertain a kindly thought for them, while Lord Baltimore would have been hailed the very pioneer of freedom and fairness.

Why is it that almost all encyclopedias, histories and books of general information are biased against the Catholic Church? It is not a matter of chance. There is a purpose behind all of it. Truth would hurt the cause of misrepresentation, and so truth must be scrupulously avoided.

Does it ever occur to a Catholic to ask what religious denomination a candidate belongs to? A Catholic will look rather for competence and merit, than for the religious affiliation of a candidate. And yet we are told that Catholics mix religion with politics!

If anyone is guilty of such a charge it is the non-Catholic voter, who hounds the Catholic voter and candidate with insulting questions and drags religion into politics.

Infidelity plays its game in a masterly way. Infidelity asks the Protestant denominations to act as cat's paws. The time is not yet ripe for infidelity to come out and fight in the open. It does not consider it prudent to wage war against all religions; hence by deception, and lies, and slanders, it works upon the emotions of Protestants to hurt the cause of Catholics. It is agreed to bar the Catholic from holding office, his faith is made ridiculous in every possible way, and whatever can help to injure the Catholic Church is undertaken with a vim and enterprise that would deserve a better purpose. Infidelity hopes to down the strongest Church first. If the Catholic Church can be brought low, it will be easy to do away with other denominations. It will be an easy task for infidelity to

destroy the last remnants of religion in Protestantism if it can only succeed in destroying the Catholic Church.

This is the plan of battle which the Catholic Church faces in our country. It is up to you, Catholic men and voters, to use the weapon of truth to fight your way through all these lies and slanders and deceits, to a victory that our dear Lord has promised when He said that the truth shall make us free.

Look up to St. Joseph, in the days he lived in pagan Egypt for the sake of the Christ-child. His position as a despised and hated Jew among the pagan Egyptians can not have been enviable. Yet he remained steadfast in all these trials. Pray to good St. Joseph to give to us, his followers, a spark of that intense and unwavering love of God that burnt in his own breast.

XXX. United for God and Country

We are often treated by our religious and political adversaries to a lot of fine words about the wonderful organization of the Catholic Church, how it appears impossible to break up that organization even though the world should unite against her. We are even complimented on the wisdom of those who build up such a wonderful union, that is the same wherever one goes, but no sooner are these same men beyond our hearing when they will say to each other: "We must break up that combination; we must put up a bigger combination to destroy it."

But what do we see in this great combination of the Catholic Church? True, we see the vast number of souls held together by the bonds of one faith, under one supreme head, the Holy Father, holding the same holy Sacraments as the means of grace; we see the everlasting work of God who founded this same holy Church, we see the divine element that remains ever young and strong through all the centuries. But what of the human element in this, our holy Church? Do we find individual Catholics organized like one man? Do we see them using the weapon of truth as they should use it? Let us take a look at our Catholic men. Go to our larger cities or to the smallest village; what do you see? You see that Catholics are divided amongst themselves. They belong to one or the other of the leading parties of our political machine, and there they are fighting each other instead of fighting their common enemy, bigotry and infidelity. If a Catholic candidate should aspire to a public office, will Catholics stand behind him as one man, to push him? Not if he is on the wrong ticket.

Where all things else are equal we should favor those of our own household. When two men aspire for a public office, the one a Catholic the other a non-Catholic and both are equally qualified to do honor to their office, it should appear no more than reasonable for Catholic voters to support the Catholic candidate. Others are doing as much for their denomination, why should we do less? It is not so very long ago that certain Catholic candidates were defeated by Catholic voters in two of our cities that boast of a large Catholic vote. Where is our organization?

Apparently it is all right for Protestants to mix politics with religion, when it is a question of preventing a Catholic candidate from getting the necessary votes; but it is *not* all right for Catholics to mix religion with politics. Yet it should seem no more than fair that what is gravy for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. Protestant preachers ascend their pulpit and actually tell their people whom they are to vote for, and whom they are *not* to vote for; they hurl their thunder against the nefarious plotting and scheming of the Church of Rome to their hearts' content. What would happen if our bishops and clergy should use the pulpit for the same purpose? If a Catholic priest dared to tell *his* people to uphold the Catholic candidate, if *we* organized political, anti-Protestant societies to keep Protestants out of office there would not be a paper in the country that would not condemn the Church. Nor is this all. Our own people would tell us, as we have been told more than once, "We take our faith from Rome, but in politics we do as we please."

Where is our organization? It is a dream, too good to be true.

What do we really see? We see our religious opponents massing for battle whenever a Catholic presumes to run for any office. And what do we do? *Nothing!* An election may take place

in New York, Illinois, or elsewhere, if a Catholic runs for any office some anti-Catholic, secret, society is there, under the auspices of some Protestant bishop or well-known politician, and the work is done with as much care and precision as money, a servile press and oratory can accomplish. The same lies, the same false charges, the same slanders are hashed and rehashed over and over, and for the most part Catholics stand by, apparently helpless, because they fail to learn. We might learn many a valuable lesson from the children of the world, but for some reason or other our Catholic men fail to grasp the lessons and the opportunities that are within their reach. We have been told so long that we Catholics are merely tolerated in this land of the free and the home of the brave, that we are positively grateful for being allowed to live!

Organization?—yes, we have a spiritual organization that holds us together as the Flock of Christ, we have organizations for social and business purposes, but such a thing as a united stand against attacks of bigots who openly dare to deprive us of our rights of citizenship—that is utterly unknown amongst us.

What do we see? Wherever we may look we behold the *real* enemies of our country massing together. Atheism, and with it socialism, are steadily and stealthily undermining the very pillars upon which civilized society rests. It is at least a remarkable coincidence that we find Protestantism allied with these forces that have the overthrow of all lawful society as their object. Is it *merely* coincidence? The combination takes place too regularly to make one think so.

What are our Catholic men doing to counteract this diabolical alliance of infidelity and bigotry? What has been done amounts about to hardly anything. Why not take a lesson from the children of the world?

Is a Catholic party in Congress necessary? Not as yet. We may be *driven* to such a step later in very self-defense; but as yet it will not be necessary if we only observe the tactics of bigots, who see no need of organizing a Protestant party. That we must be united as one man on some questions ought to be plain enough for any one of us.

Our holy Church is a leader that knows no real defeat. We have by far the best weapon—truth—yet we hesitate to use that weapon, for fear that it might hurt the feelings of those who are not of our faith, as though they ever scrupled about hurting our feelings. We have books and papers of all kinds that give the Catholic side of every controversy and on every mooted subject. But where there are ten Catholic books sold there will be sold a hundred anti-Catholic books; where we sell a hundred copies of a Catholic newspapers our enemies will sell thousands of their infamous, slanderous sheets; where we put one lecturer in the field, anti-Catholic societies will place a dozen. We have the books and the papers and the lecturers, but we do not pay any attention to them. Catholic books and papers are sold at so reasonable a price that the poorest man can buy them—yet, these books and papers go begging for buyers. If our Catholic publishing houses and lecture bureaus would be better patronized we could do a great deal more good; but, alas and alack, they lack the support of their own people. Although we are numerically stronger than any of our Protestant denominations we fall far behind them when it is a question of financial support. Look at the table in the dwelling room of our modern Catholic homes! You will find all kinds of monthly magazines except the Catholic magazines; any amount of daily papers but never a Catholic paper; all sorts of popular fiction—and not the best authors at that—but never a book by a Catholic writer. A

copy of the Catholic Bible, the lives of saints, "The Following of Christ," books of instruction such as, "The Faith of Our Fathers," are out of fashion. On the walls not a single picture of a sacred subject, the picture of Christ, a crucifix, a Madonna. These pictures, too, have gone out of style. Need we wonder why Catholics are not united? Understand, once and for all, that there should be Catholic books and papers and magazines in *your* home. Let it be understood, once and for all, that they should be placed where your children can see and read them. If the greatest artists the world ever knew thought it worth their while to make pictures of sacred subjects, do not think for a moment that your homes will suffer in beauty if you have etchings or prints of these masterpieces on your walls.

It is not that we are unable to support Catholic enterprises, we have simply depended upon others to do what each one of us should have done without being told about it.

Where is our united Catholic manhood, that will forget party lines in order to stand by one another through thick and thin? We all realize that such a condition would be a great benefit for all of us; yet we have left it to others, depending upon someone else to do for us what we should have done for one another. We see other denominations united and we must admit that as yet we have failed to learn from the children of the world. Is it not high time for us to learn the lesson of unity, of sticking together? We have an old saying: "God helps them that help themselves." No wonder we have become a joke among our political friends and enemies; we have failed to help ourselves, we have failed to assert our rights, and we get exactly what we deserve—the ridicule of our enemies.

Have we Catholics ever said we will not vote for a candidate because he is a Methodist, or Presbyterian? *We* never expect a po-

litical candidate to undergo a religious test. Then why should others ask us about our faith? If we do not vote for a candidate, it is never on religious grounds that we oppose him, but for reasons of fitness or policy. If we know a man is competent and honest he gets our vote, no matter what his religious convictions may be; if he is dishonest and incompetent he should not be entitled to any support, no matter what his religion may be. Even if a Catholic aspirant for any public office is known to be dishonest or incompetent do not vote for him. It were far better to have no Catholic office holder than to have one of whom every honest man, no matter what his religious convictions, must feel ashamed. Unfortunately there are here and there Catholic office-holders whose reputation for honesty, competency and fitness is blackened. Catholic men should be the first to oust such unworthy men from office. Your own feeling of honesty should compel you to send such unworthy men back to private life.

If a Catholic candidate is worthy of popular support forget all party lines and vote for him. Let the Guardians of Bigotry and Knights of Hell rave all they want, stand by your man and see to it that all men who love honor and fair play will stand by you, as you will stand by them.

If any legislation is contemplated that might in any way injure your rights, do not wait for others to do your protesting or fighting; do it yourselves.

Be posted in all matters of legislation, state or national, that you may always know what to say and do. When matters are proposed in state or national politics that are unfair, like church taxation and so forth, speak up! Write to your congressmen and senators. Others do it when things come up that do not suit them; why should you be silent? Silence, you know, means consent.

It will be an easy matter for you to post yourselves about the Catholic viewpoint on questions of the day if you take enough time and interest to read Catholic papers, magazines, and books.

It is up to you, Catholic men, to do your duty, to show a solid and united front to our religious enemies. You are not begging for favors, you simply demand the rights which our constitution pledges alike to all.

XXXI. The Duties of Our Catholic Men in Their Home-Life

When we look for a model family we must turn our gaze towards distant Nazareth, to the Holy Family: Jesus, Mary and Joseph.

For your own family life you cannot find a more saintly or perfect model than that family. The zealous Christian mother finds her ideal in the life of the holiest of mothers, Mary. Children find in the Christchild the model of perfect obedience. Fathers find their most beautiful model in the life of St. Joseph. If you, Catholic men, can come close to this perfect model, St. Joseph, you may well be satisfied.

The home-duties of a Catholic man we may state in three divisions: duties towards the wife, duties towards the children, and duties towards himself.

We have in our past conferences covered to some extent the duties you owe to society, and now we shall take up these various private duties you owe to your home.

When you Catholic men knelt at the foot of the altar, holding in your hand the hand of her you love, what thoughts and hopes, what fears and doubts crossed your mind! A young woman leaves her home, her people, her comforts and her girlhood friends, to put herself completely at your mercy. Your bride knew well what she left behind, but had no idea what she was to receive in exchange. She made a step into the dark for your sake, because she loved you. There, at the foot of the altar, you heard her promise that she would be ever true to you, in sickness and in health, in riches or poverty, in prosperity and in misfortune, till death would part you.

What duties do you owe to your wife?

In the first place you owe it to her to remain ever faithful to her.

When a home is broken up the reason is often that the man has given his affection to another woman. The world excuses the man's adultery by calling the second woman the "affinity," and forgives the man. If the same man should have the slightest suspicion that his wife is guilty with another man the outraged husband would often take the law into his hands by committing one or two murders. And again the world forgives the man. The man may deceive his wife ever so often, it matters little in the eyes of the world as long as he keeps his wife in clothes and spending money. Indeed, we cannot expect much better from the world, outside of the Catholic Church, because matrimony is merely a matter of convenience in the eyes of the worldly. A faithless husband is looked upon as a sport, a faithful wife as a good-enough household drudge.

It is not for us to pattern our conduct according to the dictates of the children of the world, because we are children of God. It is to be considered a matter of course that a Catholic husband will never be guilty of the sin of adultery. I might, then, dismiss this topic with that remark. Yet, I feel in duty bound to continue on this subject, asking your patience for a few minutes longer, in order to point out to you the dangers of worldly ways, because sometimes you may be in danger of looking at things in the way a careless world looks at them.

Whatever the world may say to the contrary, impurity in all its various forms is at all times forbidden. Whether people be married or single, they are never allowed to sin against purity. The most abominable, and most inexcusable impurity of all, is for a married man to be guilty of adultery, wronging his wife by giving his affection to a strange woman.

Alas, many pure married women become the pitiable victims of

filthy disease because their husbands contracted the disease in unlawful intercourse. Many babies are born with syphilitic sores because their fathers were not true to their wives. Again, many children are brought into this world who in later years, when they learn the truth, must hate and curse their unknown fathers? What widespread and untold misery the crime of adultery can bring upon an innocent wife, upon innocent children!

Nor is this all.

Even many murders are traceable to adultery. In order to hide disgrace the guilty parties will often decide to kill the child before its birth. These little ones are excluded from the kingdom of heaven because they were killed pitilessly before they can be baptized. Will they not on judgment day make themselves heard before the whole world? Then they will expose their vicious fathers and mothers to the reprehension of all mankind. Crime may be added to crime to cover up the sin of adultery, but the reckoning will come as surely as night follows day.

I know that none of you men would want to entertain even an evil thought freely and knowingly. Yet, you are not certain that you will not fall a victim to this dreadful vice of adultery if you expose yourselves to temptation. Strong and good men have fallen because they yielded to temptation. For that reason avoid the company of men who consider matrimony in the light of a joke. Avoid drinking to excess and also the kind of company that induces drunkennenss. Drunkenness is the straight road to impurity. A man who is a drunkard will hardly ever be a pure man. There are, of course, exceptions to this rule; but they are the exceptions—not the rule.

You, Catholic men, should take pride in being faithful to your wives. Your wives go to the very door of death each time they

present you with a son or daughter, and certainly they deserve from you faithfulness. Reserve whatever affection you are capable of for your wives alone. They have placed all their hopes and ambitions, all their thoughts, their heart, their very life into your strong hands and they deserve from you that you give them what they have given to you. They have given you their body and soul, their heart and mind. You owe them in justice your body and soul, your heart and your mind. Be faithful to them, for they deserve this, nay, they have the right to demand it from you.

When you see an old father and mother surrounded by a circle of grown up sons and daughters, who already have established their own families, and see them looking up to their aged parents with love and reverence, what is your first thought? There is an old happy couple who have ever been true to each other. You see the old mother giving her life partner a loving look as though she wished to say: "Look how God rewards a faithful husband and wife. We have loved each other and have loved you, children, next to God. You, too, be true and faithful to one another and in your old days you, too, will with the blessing of God see happy and good children around you as now I see you."

You, Catholic men, are the builders of your families. It is within your power to build up a home that will be the pride and consolation of your declining years.

If you, Catholic fathers, intend to do your duty, bear in mind your own future and the future of your children. When your own sons and daughters have grown up so that they understand what it means to be faithful and true, you will want them to look up to you with love and reverence, and you yourselves will want to be able to look them in the face. You will desire your sons and daughters to feel proud of you. All this is within your power if you

remain true to your wives. Your grownup sons and daughters will rather than money have an honorable name. They will gladly share your poverty, sickness and trials; but they will not be willing to forgive you when they learn that you have been brutal to their mother, and faithless to your wife.

Remain ever true, loyal and faithful to your wives, so that from your sons and daughters you may receive gratitude for a name that has been kept clean and honorable by you.

XXXII. Unity

For their common welfare and that of their children unity among husbands and wives is absolutely necessary. Husband and wife must understand that unless they want to make a failure of both their lives they must act as one in all matters.

I need not tell you that there is strength in unity We are all fond of quoting proverbs about unity; yet we often place our confidence exclusively in our own judgment and in our own strength, forgetting those beautiful sayings about unity. When afterwards we discover the mistake in relying alone on our judgment and strength we ask: "Why did we not work together"? Where there is no united effort between husband and wife, there can be no successful family life.

Woman was not intended to be above man. Neither was she intended to be beneath man. As the first woman was taken from the side of the first man, therefore woman is placed not above, nor beneath, but beside man. Marriage is the only instance where one plus one is one. Without unity there can be no happy marriage. The lack of unity means failure throughout the entire married life; economy, trust and confidence, love and authority will be lacking as well as unity.

Parents, then, must be one in all matters that concern themselves and their children. In order to bring about and to preserve this unity, parents must consult each other in whatever they wish to undertake. Neither must want or do anything without first having come to an understanding with the other. It will be impossible to arrive at an agreeable understanding unless each is willing to yield to the other's better judgment.

The old saying that two heads are better than one applies especially to husband and wife. Nothing should be undertaken by them, be it ever so triffling, without agreement. Nothing should be bought or sold by either husband or wife unless both agreeing as to the advisability of buying or selling. Whatever is given to the children, whether clothing, food or playthings, both husband and wife should be in accord. When the children understand that "yes" means "yes," and "no" means "no," no matter whether father or mother say so, there will be order and authority. The children will know that they must mind. Where the father says one thing and mother says another, the children will soon know which of the two is the more lenient. In the end neither father nor mother will be obeyed.

While it is true that the husband is the head of the family, he should always remember that the wisest of men need counsel and advice. Should your wife's idea be better than yours, so much the better for you. In case your idea is the better one and your wife does not understand your view, explain it to her in all kindness in order that she may help you to bring your plans to a successful issue.

A faithful and sensible wife and mother will never want to assume command of the family, even though you ask for her opinion. Nor need I tell you that in some things the judgment of the wife is far more correct than that of the man. In some things a woman has keener senses that will help to overcome difficulties. Yet the wife will never wish to claim the credit for any success that resulted from her advice to her husband. Her undying love for him will make her efface herself. Moreover, a husband of common sense should be only too glad to have some one who can be of help to him in his own shortcomings.

Try, then, to be always one, in every thought and in every under-

taking, for unless the two of you are *one* you cannot expect to meet with success throughout life.

As a matter of course you should never argue about things with your wife in the presence of your children. Children must never suspect that parents have to discuss any matter. All that they should see is your unity of mind and of purpose. Let them see only this and you will never experience any difficulty in maintaining your authority over them. Needless to say, discussions will not always run smoothly. There will be times when arguments may be rather bitter or personal on one side or the other, or even on both sides, for, after all, with the best of intentions we are only human. However, discussion should never leave any ill feeling. The matrimonial sky is not always sunshine. Hence you should pray for fair weather in your matrimonial life. Do the best you can, be willing to give as well as to take, so that the clouds that bring thunder and storm be as few as possible. To maintain unity of mind and purpose will require many sacrifices on both sides.

Let your children always see the bright side of your union. Father and mother should never even hint to the children that they have difficulties among themselves. Children need not know anything about the intimate life of their parents because it might not tend to strengthen the respect they should have for their parents. The love of children for their parents is naturally so great that they look upon them as perfect beings. They see faults in other people, but cannot be convinced that their parents could ever be guilty of such, unless they themselves reveal each other's faults.

In the home-life unity practically means identity. Whatever is said and done should be identically the same, whether you say or do it or whether your wife says or does it. One must support the other. Such an identity, or union of heart and mind, will bring

with it twofold blessing. In the first place, outsiders will fear to meddle in your affairs, for they will understand from your united actions that to attack the one means to attack the other as well. Hence unity of purpose will keep you at peace with the outside world. And you gain the respect and good will of the neighbors with whom you have to live. Is not this an inducement that is worth while? You will always find that husbands and wives that cannot get along with each other will neither get along with any one else. To be at peace with your neighbors will require that you be at peace with yourselves.

In the second place unity between husband and wife will be a blessing for the children. You thereby establish a thorough respect for parental authority. Whether they ask you or their mother, the answer will be the same. All that you have to do is to support one another and the children will know that yes means yes, and no means no. That will make your authority impregnable. Obedience will then follow as a matter of course.

Hence cultivate the spirit of unity. It is of the greatest importance and benefit for your welfare, both temporal and spiritual.

XXXIII. The Pocketbook

This is a much discussed topic, both in earnest and in jest, and it is a serious problem for husbands and wives. While it is true that the husband earns all the money, it is equally true that his wife is not merely a hired girl, to cook his meals, to clean the house and keep his clothes in repair. Hence it should appear proper that in ordinary circumstances there be but one pocketbook in the family, and the wife should be the treasurer of the family. By all means let the husband be the president of the corporation, but the wife makes a good treasurer.

If you have had the good sense of looking for a capable and sensible wife, you will soon discover that you have also a saving and economical wife, who is really competent to do the work you expect a good wife to do. She will see to it that you will not be the loser. She realizes what the dollar is worth and she will never be extravagant. She knows what you earn and understands that she must get along with less in order to be able to lay something aside every week to provide for the proverbial rainy day. A shrewd business man one time told me: "It is not what we earn that counts, but what we can save and lay aside." An economical wife will understand this and act accordingly in providing the household necessities. She will allow just so much and not a penny more, that she may be able to lay aside what she thinks should be saved, toward the buying of a home and other things. While you will look for the sporting page of the newspaper, she will hunt for the bargain news. She will know where she can buy best and cheapest. You may say, that is the woman of it. But not all wives are like

that, and you should thank God every day if that is the kind of wife you are blessed with. She is a treasure.

Some men there are who consider it a disgrace to give their pay envelope to their wives. Since they earn the money they cannot see why they should not spend it as they see fit. Soon, however, we see the result. In a few years the men who spent their money as they saw fit come to borrow money from the man who gave his earnings to a saving wife. The industrious husband of the saving wife will in a few years have money enough to lend to others, while the man who spends his money as he sees fit is soon compelled to borrow. Who of these men is the better off, he who made his wife the treasurer of his earnings, or the silly man who was bound to spend his money as fast as he could earn it?

The priest has many opportunities for observing the ways of families. He goes from one parish to another and in each he discovers people of all kinds. He sees people who spend their money as fast as they can earn it; he finds families who live beyond their income, and he finds happy and industrious families that rise from poverty to riches, although the earnings of the father are by no means greater than the average wage.

Let me open up for you the book of experience of the priest.

I remember one family of which the husband was a hard working man, earning usually from four to five dollars a day. Yet had it not been for the fact that the family lived with the mother of the wife they would not have had a roof over their head. The wife had the unfortunate habit of always spending more money than the husband could earn. She was extravagant in the household, in dressing herself and her children. That mother was not able to alter or make a dress. That the husband had serious quarrels with

his wife about her extravagance may be understood. Then she would pretend to get sick. To humor her, and to get the doctor out of the house, the husband would have to give in and again give his earnings to her. And so things remained as they were.

Although one dislikes the idea of wife-beating there were men who suggested that a good sound beating was what this woman needed. I think myself that both husband and wife were in urgent need of a competent guardian, and possibly a beating was due to the husband for having been such a fool as to marry a girl too lazy to work.

When a man has a wife like that it certainly is not wise for him to give his pocket-book to her. It is his duty to keep her from doing harm and injury to the family by enforcing certain ironclad rules, that allow of no exceptions. Withal he should in all his firmness be kind to her, and in most cases his example and persuasion will make her see the error of her ways.

Against this case of an extravagant wife I can cite many cases of reckless men, who brought ruin and misery upon their families by spending their money for drink and even worse.

Whenever you find an unsuccessful family, one that toils without prospering, it is usually the fact that the husband, or the wife, or both are to blame for that condition of affairs.

I fear we are too rash in ascribing to Divine Providence the unhappiness and misfortunes we see around us. We may safely say that three-fourths of present day poverty and misery must be laid to the mismanagement of husband or wife. This is the sort of poverty that cries and laments the most about the injustices of God, about the cruelty of the world, and so on. Such poverty is of the devil. The poverty that God sends as a trial is different. We hear little of it, no wailings, no lamentations about injustice.

It is borne with a fortitude and resignation that only God will know, esteem and reward.

Let us turn to another and more pleasant picture from life.

A certain newly married couple came here to live. They rented a few rooms, all they needed for the present. Both were good people, he a hard working man with no bad habits, she a good woman and an ambitious housekeeper. They paid their rent the day it was due, and met all their bills promptly. It happened that the house belonged to a woman advanced in years. She had seen much of the ways of the world but had not lost sympathy and kindliness of heart.

When one day the young wife came again to pay the rent, the older woman suggested that a trifle more money each month would in the course of a few years get them their own home. The younger woman understood the reasoning but had her misgivings. What if her husband should grow sick and unable to work? Then the landlady told the younger woman of a modest little cottage that could be bought very reasonably. "To show you my good will," the older woman continued, "I will let you have this rent and enough more to make up fifty dollars as a first payment. You can repay me when you have the money. But now you go and buy that home for yourselves so you have a start in life. That is the way my husband and I made our start."

The young couple acted upon this sensible advice and their thrift and economy were visibly blessed by God. They grew to be wealthy, but never forgot to offer to others a helping hand, as the old landlady had offered it to them.

A competent wife can make her husband a successful man and by all means she should have the pocketbook. It was this young wife's thrift and competent management, more so than her hus-

band's hard work and good habits, that induced the wise old lady to help them along, although, had the husband been a spendthrift and drunkard, she would certainly not have made the offer.

Therefore, once more, to insure your temporal welfare, your family establishment must have in you a good president, and in your wife a good treasurer.

XXXIV. Charity

As long as the honeymoon lasts the husband sees a halo over the head of his wife and she cannot see anything but perfection in her husband. Neither can see the least fault or blemish in the other. Gradually, however, the halo fades and the dreams of the honeymoon give way to reality. They begin to see in each other faults they had never suspected. The husband sees shortcomings in his wife and the wife discovers in her husband failings of which she never thought he could be guilty.

Is this to be the end of love?

The faults the wife is now discovered to have she had before marriage. The husband did not want to see them. The husband had his failings before the marriage, but his bride was blind to them, though her parents may have endeavored to call her attention to them. But this does not mean the end of love, on the contrary it means the beginning of the true love that outlasts the grave. Unless love rests on the foundation of Christian charity it is bound to collapse like a house of cards. And just because this Christian Charity is practically unknown outside of the Catholic Church we hear and read of so many divorces.

It is the appreciation of these faults and shortcomings in husband and wife that really prompts the two, man and woman, to bind themselves together until death parts them. If the husband is candid, he sees faults in himself that he should like to have compensated for by a good quality in the wife. Our love of self prompts us to look elsewhere for a being that will make up for our shortcomings. That is the fundamental reason why man and woman join in a bond to attempt united to make one perfect being. The man feels that he

lacks the finer feelings of sentiment, of patience, of forbearance, of implicit trust. He craves more than what is commonly meant by friendship. He looks for a closer union than a friendship that may end at any time. He looks for a being of the opposite sex that will agree to form one personality with him. The woman also sees her limitations. She realizes that she lacks strength and self-confidence, that her feeling is in control of her reasoning, that she is a frail vine that needs a strong oak for support, and consequently she looks for one of the opposite sex in which she discovers the very qualities she needs to be a perfect being. Hence the longing of the female for a union that will be permanent. In His infinite wisdom God made the two sexes dependent upon one another to form through the bonds of matrimony a perfect being.

Of whatever minor faults husband and wife may be guilty, they must bear in mind that they are due to our human nature, that has fallen from its high estate through the sin of our first parents, and right here it is that Christian Charity, the virtue of forgiveness, of patience and forbearance, is absolutely essential for the life of love. Without Christian Charity a true and lasting love is utterly impossible. Love needs charity as a flower needs sunshine.

Consider the imprudence of a young couple to whom Christian Charity is unknown.

On the impulse of the moment such a couple agree to marry. It is so easy to get married. When after a few weeks the honeymoon wanes they become aware of each other's faults, and soon recourse is taken to the divorce court. They leave the courtroom as strangers, each one in search of another mate. In all probability the same thing will be repeated over and over again.

What a different affair it is when two Catholics come to the steps of the altar to become husband and wife. The Catholic couple

realizes that they are entering upon a union according to the plans of God, a union to last as long as life. However well they may be disposed at heart, however lofty their intentions, they understand that unless Christian Charity is the foundation of their love their seeking for happiness, their wish for a true and lasting love, will be in vain. That is why they promise each other to be faithful until death will part them. That is why they take God for a witness that they will keep that promise until death.

Christian Charity as practised by husband and wife toward one another means that husbands and wives must, first, overlook and forgive each other's faults and shortcomings, and, secondly, help one another in overcoming these faults, for the love of God.

A false love of self makes us see even trifling faults in others while our own faults will remain unnoticed by us, though they be large and ugly.

Christian Charity helps us to remove the blindness from our self love. It shows us, by the help of God, how we, too, are guilty of the faults we see in others. Moreover, Christian Charity bids us to forgive as we hope to be forgiven. God is revealed to us as the great Forgiver of our sins, and we are asked to imitate God in His generosity and love by forgiving others as God forgives us.

The husband sees faults in his wife. He must tell himself that he too has faults. Hence his duty of forgiving the wife's faults as he wishes his wife to forgive him his faults. When you have tried earnestly to overcome certain faults and, with the grace of God, you have succeeded, you would certainly feel hurt if your wife were to hold that old fault up to you. You want her to forget that unpleasant matter. Very well, but remember it hurts your wife just as much to be reminded by you of her shortcomings. Do as you wish others to do to you. Your wife sees your faults. You want

her to have patience. Forgive and forget on your part as you wish her to forgive and forget.

As God in His love helps us to overcome our faults and shortcomings, so in a similar manner husband and wife should lovingly help each other in avoiding faults and mistakes. If one is quick-tempered the other should be so much more patient and forbearing, in order to smoothen the rough edge of the other's character. If one is inclined to be easy-going and careless the other must be so much more careful and energetic. That, of course, will demand tact so as not to hurt feelings. If one is lukewarm in religious duties the other must be so much more devout, in order to bring the lukewarm one back to his or her duties. Thus the wife must try to correct the shortcomings of her husband and he in turn must help in correcting the faults of the wife. Each must offer the other a support in the infirmities of human nature, and with patience and good-will they will be able to be of great help to one another in striving for perfection.

God intended that the real task of life, the saving of the soul, should be made easier in the holy state of matrimony, where two are joined to help each other in the gaining of heaven. For that reason Christian Charity will not be content with removing the faults of one another, but will inspire both, husband and wife, to help each other in the gaining of virtues. Zeal for the honor and glory of God, zeal for the spreading of God's holy Church, piety, purity, a living faith, humility, obedience, patience, resignation, all these are virtues that should distinguish a Catholic husband and wife as different from worldly people and as children of God. It remains for husbands to help their wives, and for wives to help their husbands, in gaining the virtues upon which their temporal and eternal happiness depend.

So you see that real love does not die with the waning of the honeymoon. The love of husband and wife must be so great that even death cannot part them. Hence a true and lasting love must be a holy love, a love akin to that love that God has for you, His children and heirs.

And only then, when their love rests upon Christian Charity, will the love of husband and wife be holy and true. It is your duty, then, to practise Christian Charity constantly towards one another, in thoughts, and words, and deeds. The sacred fire of this divine love will burn away all the dross, and bring out as shining gold a truly virtuous life that will be your consolation on earth and your joy in the world to come, where the two of you are again united with God, never to part again.

XXXV. The Right of Life

Among married men and among married women it often happens that matters most sacred and private become the topics of conversation and gossip. Among such topics, that common decency should prevent people even from mentioning, will be the rights of the married, the number of children a man or woman will want to raise, the means whereby the number of children can be limited and other such matters. The names of disreputable physicians who give their help to crimes against offspring are passed from mouth to mouth, and evil advice is eagerly given to make it easy for the devil to claim more victims.

It is with great reluctance that I venture to talk upon this subject, so sacred and so delicate, but realizing my duty as a priest, who is entrusted with the care of your souls, and relying upon the help from the holy family, Jesus, Mary and Joseph, I will attempt to undertake the task with offense to none.

The holy Sacrament of Matrimony was not instituted for the purpose of giving to woman a home or to man a cook and housekeeper, but for the purpose of having children come from the union of one man and one woman.

As a rule, a man loves children. Most decent men take pride in having large families. Still there are those who have been brought in contact with worldly people, men who think they are privileged to dictate how many children, or rather, how few children, they will want to have.

In our days, surrounded as we are by people who believe in no God, there is great danger lurking where we might least expect it. Some of our Catholic families have been affected by it and, judging from experience, have been influenced by the pernicious doctrine of

race suicide. We have husbands who think that one or two children are enough for any family. We hear women declare they will under no condition have more than one child. They would rather have none at all, since children are such a nuisance and bother. We hear people talking of hard times, of the high cost of living, the difficulty of raising children properly in these times, and all these conditions are said to justify people in their criminal practices.

Some one may now ask: how many children should there be in a family. I shall not decide this question for you; neither may you. That question is for God to answer. God is the author and master of life. It is He who gives life, and it is He who takes it.

God graciously permits husband and wife to become the instrument in His work of creating man. Husband and wife are tools in the hands of Almighty God. He makes use of them for creating new human beings, and who do you think is the master—the married couple or God? Our holy Faith tells us that God is the supreme Lord and Master over life and death. It is God who gives life and takes it. From this, then, it should be plain that it depends upon God to decide the number of children in a family. It never can be a question for husband and wife to decide, nor for neighborhood clubs to discuss. Whether your family should have five, or eight, or ten children, or whether God will take all of them from you before they grow up, all this is a matter that God alone decides. All that is expected of you is that you do nothing to interfere with the plans of God, the Lord and Master over life and death.

It is of course neither prudent nor just to form judgment from the outer appearance of things. In some cases children are denied to married people who are quite innocent of wrong doing, who are in fact sincerely longing for children. It would be both cruel and sinful to rashly suspect married couples that have no children, or

but few children, and I warn you against gossip that voices such suspicions. But, while warning you against suspicion, it is nevertheless true that many married people resort to unlawful and sinful means to prevent offspring.

Some women fear they may lose their charm and youthfulness if they give birth to children; so, rather than become mothers they are willing to commit murder.

But there are also men who do not wish large families. There is the cost of high living, there is the fallacy, one hears so often, of better being able to provide well for one or two children than for many, that it be better to bring up one or two children properly than to have many and neglect them. These men, too, prefer murder to being fathers. That all these pretended reasons are lacking of justification we shall see.

There is no murder more cowardly and cruel than the murder of a child before its birth. Whereas any other victim would have some strength to defend himself, the unborn child is unable to do so. Is it really possible that a civilized people can sink so low as to commit murder for the sake of comfort; so low, that the animals of the field have more parental instinct than many human beings of our days?

Children are not so much the personal property of parents as a sacred trust that God has given to them. And because man has not the right to interfere with the plans of God, the Catholic Church has always stood for the right of life of the unborn child, and in the name of God she has always called murder what really is murder. Whether the murdered victim is a full-grown man, or a child unborn, murder is murder. The commandment which says: "Thou shalt not kill," applies to both cases with equal justice.

For centuries doctors who have no conscience have fought this

stand of the Catholic Church. Scientists came to tell us that the Catholic Church was out of fashion, was opposed to science, until to-day, after all these centuries, science and medical skill have at last caught up with the Catholic Church. At last they have discovered that it is not necessary to kill the child in order to save the life of the mother. After all, it was not the Church but science that was wrong.

Childbearing of itself has really never harmed a mother. Call to mind the mothers of big families. In their old age these mothers look healthier, are stronger, more cheerful and happier than women who in their married life have murders upon their conscience through preventing the birth of children. Motherhood is the natural function of woman, for which she has been especially endowed and strengthened by God. No man or woman can go contrary to the plans of God without paying the penalty.

As to the argument that it is better to bring up one child properly than to have many that cannot be well provided for, I will say this. Look at a nursery of young trees. Why are all those young trees as straight as a rod? You will say, because they grow closely together. Look at a tree growing alone. It bends this way and that, and gradually it grows crooked. The only child is invariably a spoiled child, just as a young tree growing up by itself takes usually a crooked shape. Moreover, what assurance have the parents of one child that it will live? Is it less likely for the one child of a family to die than for a child in a family of eight or ten? Have you not seen cases where God took three or more children from their parents within the time of a year? Not the parents, but God is the author of life and He takes life when He pleases, and where He pleases, and how He pleases.

There is one other matter I wish to mention and it is that you,

the older men of the parish, who have married sons and daughters, do not instruct your grownup sons and daughters properly. The matter about which we speak to-day is one mentioned in the instruction before marriage, where such is the custom. Then again the matter will be mentioned, more less plainly, during missions and they do not take place often, and when they do it happens that they who might profit the most by the instructions of a missionary are not in attendance. It is up to you, fathers of married sons and daughters, it is up to your wives, to give these instructions. If you learn that your son or daughter are at fault, instruct them earnestly about the heinousness of this sin. Tell them of the sacrifices they are expected to make for their coming children, even as you have made sacrifices to bring up your sons and daughters. Tell them they have the duty of doing the same for their children. Tell them they must carry out the holy Will of God on behalf of their children, as you performed the Will of God on their behalf. You have given them life and now they are to help God continue the work of creating more souls for heaven. Teach them to look up to the holy Family of Nazareth, that they may always be willing to do as God demands them to do.

XXXVI. The Training of Children

It is not enough for fathers and mothers to give life to their children; they are bound to train their souls so that the children may also be the children of God and heirs of Heaven.

You who are fully grown and fully instructed in the conditions we must observe in order to enter Heaven, are obliged to bring up your children to walk in the way that God has prescribed for all of us.

The word "training" is used advisedly. Children must be *trained*. Training means the constant care and diligence exercised by parents for the purpose of leading their children on the right path, even before their reason is sufficiently developed to know right from wrong.

One day I met a man, who had the queer idea of letting his children do in everything as they liked. They were not to go to any church until they would be of age. When they became of age, they were to decide what church they wished to join. The children of that man could do exactly as they pleased. When they felt like it they came home, they could do and go and come just as they pleased. He did not see the necessity of training a child whose reasoning faculty was still dormant. If it had not been for the sensible mother all the children would have gone wrong. She was able to save most of them.

The arguments of that foolish man might have some weight if children knew right from wrong from their birth, and if it were not for our weak human nature that finds it easier to do wrong than right. This man might have been correct in his reasoning if we human beings were self-existing, independent and supreme beings,

who could make their own laws. As a matter of fact we are neither independent nor supreme beings, we cannot make our laws of conduct to suit ourselves, and for our very existence we are dependent upon another Being. In fact we are not even allowed to accept of the laws of this Supreme Being those we like and discard those that do not suit us. Depending upon the Supreme Being, who has given us life and existence, we are in duty bound to listen and to obey.

Whatever we are, whatever we have, we owe to God, and hence, as a simple matter of justice, He has certain rights over us. It is not for us to determine whether we shall obey God by submitting to His laws, as though we were conferring a favor upon God by obeying Him. The obedience we owe to God is not in the nature of a favor, that we might grant or refuse to God without in any way doing injustice to God or ourselves, but in the nature of a plain and solemn duty. God can compel us to obey Him much like a master compels his slave; but He does not want that kind of service from us. He has given us the freedom of choice. Reason shows us our relation to God, experience tells us the consequences that come from good and evil actions, and the teaching of God reveals to us the reward and punishment God has in store. Hence, good, common sense would tell us that we must not abuse the gift of free will. Therefore, no one expects to be invited to obey the laws of God. The state does not invite us by a special invitation to obey its laws. As long as we are law-abiding we are not molested; but courts and prisons await us if we become guilty of a breach of the law. We obey the laws of the land, not so much for fear of punishment, but because obeying these laws insures our prosperity and national happiness. So, in a similar manner, we obey the laws of God not only because He threatens punishment, but because our

very happiness here and hereafter depend upon our living in conformity to the laws of God.

What a folly then for a father to permit his children to grow up lawless, that they may decide when they are twenty-one what laws they are willing to obey.

No doubt, you have seen trained animals of various kinds. They did not train themselves. They had to be compelled to do certain things, by a man with a strong will. Whatever will or impulse these animals had was overridden by the stronger will of the man. Thus these animals in the course of time acquire habits of doing some things in a certain way. What we consider marvelous tricks of these animals is nothing but the manifestation of certain habits which the skill and strong will of the trainer was able to give them.

The training of children is done in a similar manner. Whereas the animal has no reasoning power and no free will, we do not imply that the child is on the same level with the brute. But the mind of the child is still dormant, and its will must be developed and trained, because before the mind will come to its full development the will might be used injuriously, and thus the child must be made to form *habits* of doing what is right.

The careful forming of habits to do what is right and proper, is what we call training. Then when in the course of time the reasoning faculty awakens, the child adopts by habit that which is right, without asking for many arguments. Before the will was able to get the habit of choosing what is wrong, it was given a certain bend or leaning towards that which is truly right, it received the habit of choosing right.

A few examples will bring out the point.

You wish your little child to be of a grateful nature. You do not wait, however, until you can explain to the child what gratitude

is. The child could not now grasp your arguments. What do you do? You accustom the child to say "thank you," whenever you or anybody else gives the child something. If the child forgets to say "thank you," you remind him of it. The child will remember he must say "thank you" and he says it. A habit is formed in course of time, and the child will say these words without having to be reminded. Then people will remark how grateful and polite your child is. But it is your training that has made the child grateful and polite. As yet he does not realize what gratitude and politeness means. In later years, when the child grows up, the lesson will come home all the more forcibly, and the child will really be grateful to *you* for having been trained properly. The child must be "trained" in all virtues and obligations in a similar manner. Another example will further illustrate my meaning. A child has no definite idea what personal property means. You cannot argue with the child why he must not steal. In his childish way he thinks he may have all he sees if he can lay hands on it. The training will be to compel the child to ask for whatever he wants and needs. Some parents make the serious mistake of permitting the child to take whatever he sees at home. Do not permit the child to help himself at any time. Teach him to ask. I will admit that this manner of training is bothersome at times, but it is worth the trouble. Some parents are of the opinion that the child can have all he wants at home. If the child is hungry, they send him to the pantry to help himself, for they argue that whatever is theirs belongs to the child as well. All this is true; yet the child cannot distinguish what belongs to you and what may belong to the folks on the other side of the fence. The child not knowing the difference will as readily take what belongs to them as what belongs to you. If you train your child to ask for anything he wants, he will soon learn that he cannot have all he

sees. If you wish your children to become thieves as they grow up let them help themselves to your money drawers, your pantry, and to whatever they see. When they have come to the use of their reason, their will will be lacking of control, and they will take what they can get. If, however, you train your children to ask for things at home, they will have the habit when they come to the use of their reason. A child trained in this manner will not be likely to become a thief.

These hints will suffice to show the meaning of training. Your own good sense should tell you how best to train your children in the various virtues and duties they are to perform.

There are two other things I must refer to here. The first is that you should never promise the children anything that you will not do. To tell children that you will burn their tongues if they tell a lie will be very foolish. You know you would not do that. To threaten with policemen and the like, is unwise, for the children may do the things you forbid and when they see that no policeman comes they will feel that they are safe in being naughty. Use other means to make the children mind you. Fairytales are allright in their place, but you must use other arguments when you wish your children to be obedient.

The other remark I wish to make concerns corporal punishment. Whatever may be said by our modern educators and fadists, the old rule of "spare the rod and spoil the child" still holds good.

Of course, different children must be treated in different ways. All cannot be treated alike. Some children are so sensitive and so delicate of feeling that an angry look hurts them more than a sound beating will hurt another. But there are some children who cannot be brought to reason except by a good thrashing. So take your children as they are. If repeated advice has not brought results, if

depriving them of some plaything or game does not bring them to time, you will have to use sterner methods; that is all. We are dependent upon all of our five senses for the gaining of knowledge and experience. If for some reason hearing and seeing is without effect on a child there is the sense of feeling available, and the child that will not hear should be made to "feel." All this may sound rather old-fashioned, yet all you older men know that this system of training has yielded good results.

XXXVII. The Forming of Habits

Let one but perform a certain act frequently and it will become easier with each repetition, and in a short time he will have contracted the habit of doing this act. Man is to a very great extent a creature of habits. And even though we attempt a change of habit we usually find ourselves drifting back to the accustomed manner of living.

We will, for the better understanding of what is to follow, divide habits into two classes, the good and the bad. The good habits we call virtues, the bad, vices. Hence, the virtue of piety does not mean an occasional act of supplicating God, once a month or once a year, but the habit of praying at regular times. By doing something often and consistently, it becomes a habit. It may become as easy and natural for us to say our prayers as it is to eat and sleep. Then the heart and the mind become so thoroughly trained, that it is not difficult at all to raise them up to God at any time and any place. This is what it means to have the virtue of piety. It is understood, of course, that when we speak of any virtue, we do not lose sight of its supernatural character. Grace is necessary for the performing of every good deed, or word, or thought, and it is only reasonable to believe that, if a single act needs the grace of God to perform it, the continuance of this act, which results in the forming of a habit, requires still more graces. In regard to God, then, a virtue represents a number of graces that He, in His bounty and mercy, has conferred upon a soul; and on the part of man, it means the repeated performance, assisted by those graces, of some certain good act. This holds good for every virtue. In the same way as one act of piety does not

constitute a virtue, so, also, the committing of one bad deed is not a vice. It requires a repetition of that bad deed for a wicked habit to be formed, which then is a vice.

The longer we live, the more we become set in our ways, and the stronger become our habits. When wax is in a liquid state it can be molded into almost any shape. But, when the wax has once been cast into a certain shape it cannot be changed without breaking it. In the same way when once we have our settled ways it is very difficult to change them.

Whenever you see children or young people conducting themselves properly, you know that they have had a careful bringing up at home. If it were not for that strict home training the inclination to evil inherent in us would be uppermost in those young people. Their parents understood the necessity of systematically counteracting this evil impulse in their children, and as a result they are well behaved children.

You need not be told the fate of those that are left to act according to their evil impulses. To avoid that fate conscientious parents will train their children to good habits.

From these remarks you will understand the value of child training, the forming and fostering of good habits in the hearts and minds of children, to prevent the evil inclinations and impulses from gaining the upper hand. If parents neglect this sacred duty, the evil inclinations will make themselves felt all too soon, and after they have gained a foothold, it will be almost impossible to uproot them. Take for instance people who are quick-tempered, who flare up at the least provocation. Why have they no patience or self-control? Because their parents neglected to train them properly at the time when these evil impulses might have been subdued. Now, it is too late.

When is the proper time to develop good habits in children? I might just as well ask: "When should people call in a doctor?" Should they wait until the fever has reached the highest point, or should they call him in time, that he may be able to check the sickness before it has taken a firm hold? Your common sense will tell you that you must not permit the evil impulses and inclinations of your children to get a firm hold on them. The evil inclinations of children make themselves manifest even before the little ones can speak or reason. Hence, the training must begin, not when the children are old enough to vote or marry, but even before reason begins to dawn. A glass of water may put out a fire at its start, but give it an opportunity to gain headway and it can only be quenched after much damage has been done. On the same principle you must be on your guard to overcome the first indications of an evil inclination. The reason for this should be very plain. In the first place the habits formed in childhood become deeply rooted, and obtain a fast hold upon the hearts and minds of children. From time to time you will observe young people going wrong. If, in their early childhood, they had been trained in forming good habits, those habits would exert a good influence upon them and bring them back to the straight path. They would take courage and endeavor to do better. True it is, that all who err could take courage, and begin anew, but often they fail to do so because their proper training in childhood days has been neglected. Even though they may struggle against evil, they lack the force which an early training would have given them. Their will and their heart are not in harmony with their efforts. For this reason the early development of good habits is a source of strength for both will and character, and therein we have the second reason why an early training is absolutely necessary.

Contrary to present-day views, the will of man is his highest and noblest faculty. People are loud in praising the mind. But, while all people cannot have intellects enriched with learning, because some lack the mental fitness or opportunity, all people without exception have the faculty of will, and even the most unschooled man, who can hardly write his name, can train his will to do what is pleasing to God. A man may have the most penetrating intellect, may be a master in arts and sciences, but if his will should fail him, his life will be a failure. Why do people so frequently praise the mind and so seldom the will? Some do this because they dislike to render to God the things that are God's; others because they do not realize that the will is far superior to the mind.

Here you have the faculties of the souls of your children: the will, the mind, and the memory. The first, being the highest and noblest of all mental faculties, proclaims itself before all others. Before reason dawns, the will of the child makes itself known in an unmistakable way. Reason, and memory with it, will become manifest at the third or fourth year. Just about that time little children will have countless questions for you to answer, for then they begin to reason things out, and, to satisfy themselves, they interrogate the parents about nearly every subject under the sun. Curiosity, the desire to know, is a sign that the children are beginning to learn, and parents will act wisely if they direct that inquisitiveness into proper channels. As religion should be uppermost in us, in all we think, speak, and do, parents should undertake to see that religion is the very first subject about which the children hear, think, and talk. Therefore parents should speak to their little ones about God, and about the fact that He is present in our churches, impressing upon them the fact that He sees and knows all things. As the children begin to know of God, the

prayers they learned even before they could understand them, will begin to have a meaning for them.

Parents are guilty of a crime if they neglect to properly train their little ones in time. There is no reason to wait till they can grasp the full meaning of sin, because even we grown people are unable to do that. To appreciate the importance of child-training, you, fathers, must bear in mind that you are responsible not to your children, but to God, for the successful bringing up of your children. For the performance of this duty God has given you sufficient knowledge and experience, and, moreover, He has given you the holy Faith, that you may be fitted to do this sacred work. Not content with all this, God gave you special graces, through the Sacrament of Matrimony, that you may not fail in giving back to God the souls He entrusted to your keeping.

I think that you all were blessed with pious fathers and mothers. In order that you may know what you should do, in the way of child-training, go back, in memory, to your earliest recollection, to see what you were told to do, and what you were forbidden to do. If you follow the system of your good fathers and mothers, I am sure you will not go wrong in bringing up your own children. And you, older members, the fathers of married sons and daughters, of a quiet evening, when the little ones are to bed, tell your married sons and daughters how you curbed their first signs of stubbornness, of temper, and so forth, and tell them that, if they want to perform their duties towards their own little ones, they must use the same method, the same means that you used in your day. And the fathers with parents still alive, should ask them to help you accomplish this greatest and holiest of all tasks, the proper training of your children, so that one day God may say to you: "Well done, thou good and faithful father."

XXXVIII. Bending the Will

There is but one way of building a house. One must begin at the bottom and build up. You cannot begin at the roof and build down to the foundation. So, too, with the training of children, one must begin at the foundation.

From your observation of children, you know that temper and stubbornness are the first signs of the evil inclination that is inborn in all of us. The first outbreak of such temper or stubbornness is the first warning for parents to be on their guard. As yet the infant is unable to speak or reason. You cannot explain to the child how wicked or how injurious it is to be stubborn; yet you are bound to heed this first sign, for if you do not, the child will become accustomed to having its own way, and you will find it hard to control. The little one may not be even a year old, and yet it wants to be your master. Humor it and you will soon know that it is your master. The child itself is a helpless infant, but its will is a veritable giant. It is as unbending and strong as the will of a grown man. The child sets its will upon some certain thing, and demands it with all the power of its little body. Here, then, is the first clash of wills. Is *your* will to be the stronger, or will that of the *child* be the stronger. Who will give in? Naturally both cannot win; one must be the stronger, the other the weaker. If the will of the child had the same help of knowledge, experience and grace that you have, one might say that, the wills being equal in everything, it should matter little which of them should gain the victory. However, as it is, you know your will is the only one equipped with the necessary faculties, and hence, should obtain its way.

Have you ever noticed how some parents give in to every whim of their children? The children can do exactly as they please, and the parents do not remonstrate. If the children do not feel like coming home in time for a meal, the parents will wait with their meal until the children put in an appearance. Such humoring brings a dreadful penalty with it. In later years these same children will have no respect for their parents, and will laugh at them, if they should in any way presume to give them any advice. The parents then find many reasons to account for the waywardness of children. They attribute it to bad company, evil surroundings, bad pictures, papers, books, and so forth. Some even put blame on the weather and climate for things that have gone wrong. Excuses are never lacking. But why are not *all* children wayward? Oh, well, they say, they have stricter parents but we do not want to rule our children with too much severity.

According to this reasoning it is wrong to be severe with children, and to enforce obedience, and it is humane and proper to spoil children and make wrecks of their lives by allowing them all liberties. With such parents nothing can be done; they will have to swallow their bitter medicine, when it will be too late to make a change.

When an infant shows the first sign of temper, it does so without reasoning. The first times the will of the child clamors for recognition are nothing but a test. Reason will neither be helped nor hindered in its growth, whether the will wins or fails in this first test. Should the will of the child succeed in gaining its way in this first test, the result will be that the parents will be hard pressed to overcome the will of the child on a second occasion. And as the will of the infant grows stronger the will of father and

mother grows more yielding. Is there much prospect of ever implanting in that child instincts of obedience? To form habits in another, the control over the will of the other is the very first requisite. Without that attempts to direct the will of the child into proper channels will be a failure.

By all means, for your own comfort and peace of mind, as well as for the welfare, both temporal and spiritual, of your child, never permit the surrender of your will to that of your little child.

When a little child cries, first see whether there is a reason for the tears. If it is fed and has no pains or hurts, but simply cries because it wants to have its own way about something, then it is when you must pit your will against that of the child. Here it is that the child must be made to feel that it cannot have its own way under any consideration.

If you cannot conquer the child, the child will conquer you. Do you not often hear parents complaining that their children will not mind them? The plain truth is that the parents did not insist upon being minded when their children were young, and now they cannot control them.

As obedience is the first and most important virtue in the child, it must be given first place in its training. There can be no other virtue unless obedience is the foundation. Hence, if you desire the child to cultivate virtue, it must be your effort to instil obedience first. Obedience has its source in the will. For that reason your first duty is to bend the will of the child. When you have conquered the will of the child, obedience will follow as the first fruit and blessing of your efforts, and the other virtues, like truthfulness, honesty, gratitude and so forth, will thrive easily when obedience, the first of all virtues, has been firmly established.

Here you have the necessity of building upwards. Unless the will of the child has been tamed and made to mind, it will be useless to attempt to inculcate any other virtue. The will of the child must be made to feel that it must obey the stronger and wiser will of the parents. I say "feel," advisedly because as yet the child is unable to think or to listen to an explanation.

To teach the child the value of numbers, it would be foolish to begin with algebra and trigonometry. All this would be unintelligible to the child. It must first learn the simple numbers, the meaning of addition, subtraction, division, fractions, and decimals, and when it understands all these parts thoroughly, the higher studies may be grasped by the child. In the same way, when you wish to teach a child reading, you do not give it one of Shakespeare's plays to read. The child must first learn to know the meaning of each letter of the alphabet, and the combinations of various letters into syllables and words. And even then it will first be able to form words of but three or four letters. And so it is with all our learning, it must begin with the fundamental lessons of each study. The same rule must be observed in training children. Unless you begin with the mastery over the will of your child your efforts will be of little account.

Obedience must be taught even before the child is able to see the reason. There will be plenty of time to discuss the reason later on, when the child can grasp it. When the child has progressed enough to understand that God demands obedience from all beings, and, when the virtue of obedience has been thoroughly established in the child, then this reasoning will help to confirm the virtue of obedience. The child will then, fully understanding the motive for obedience, be all the more docile, seeing that such is the will of God.

Once more, obedience must be insisted upon before the child can think. The little one, although as yet unable to reason, is able to see and hear and feel. A look, a warning finger, or, if necessary, gentle punishment, will show the child that its will is not the law for parents. The child must be made to feel that its will is weaker than that of father and mother, and hence cannot have its way.

The old saying about sparing the rod and spoiling the child is as true to-day as it was a thousand years ago. For, while impulses may vary and styles may change, human nature remains ever the same.

There are some people in our day who abhor the very idea of physical punishment as being cruel, heartless, brutal, unreasonable, and incompatible with our enlightened age. But why do we find God inflicting both temporal and eternal punishment? Think for a moment how God punishes sin, how He punished the fallen angels, the first parents; how He punished His chosen people when they fell away from Him. And God does not punish on earth alone, He has an eternal punishment in store for those who die in mortal sin. If God in His infinite wisdom and justice sees necessity for punishment, who are we that we may denounce punishment as incompatible with our enlightened age!

Reason alone is not enough to keep us law-abiding, however much people may boast about the excellence of our godless educational system. There are those who put their whole trust in education, as though it were the sheet-anchor of our civilization. Yet, figuratively speaking, beside our school houses and colleges and universities we see court houses and prisons, in which many a man who boasts of a college diploma or university degree is brought to justice for his evil doings.

Now, if grown-up people, with all the advantages of education and their reasoning faculties, are unable to be law-abiding without the lesson of pain and punishment, how can any man expect children to submit to parental authority, unless they have become aware of the meaning of pain and punishment? Surely one cannot expect more of a child, that is unable to reason, than of a man whose reasoning power is fully developed.

XXXIX. Punishments

As there are no two leaves alike on one and the same tree, so, too, there are no two children alike even in one and the same family. It will be the duty of parents to study their children and to treat them in the way best suited for them. Hence it is that no two children can be punished in the same way. One child may be so tender and delicate, so sensitive in its feeling, that a stern glance will be enough to call it to time. I have seen children who would cry bitterly when they were given only an angry look. Nothing more needed to be said or done, for they would surely avoid making the same blunder again. Other children, less tender and sensitive, will have to get a gentle scolding and they, too, will do better. Others need a good talking to before they will mind. Others still must be humbled and made to feel ashamed of themselves before their wills will bend, and there may be needed other punishment to make them mind. Punishments vary in many ways. Some children will feel they are punished by not being allowed a certain plaything; others feel it keenly if they are deprived of some favorite dish; others are best punished by some extra work; finally there are those that cannot be ruled except by bodily chastisement.

Children being so different, it is necessary for parents to understand their children well that they may not make a mistake in managing them. It would be as cruel to whip a tender-hearted and sensitive child for its first offense, as it would be useless to coax with candy a wicked boy who in his stubbornness has repeated the same offense over and over again.

As offenses vary, so, too, the punishment cannot be alike in all

cases. Hence, ordinarily speaking, punishment must fit the crime. Again we must distinguish between the first offense and repeated offenses.

All these things require judgment and patience on the part of parents.

As to punishment itself, we find two purposes in it. One is an act of atonement for a wrong, the other is a means to prevent the repetition of that wrong. Whenever a punishment has not these two purposes as its aim the punishment is out of order. If, for example, parents punish their children with the sole intention of getting even for having been provoked or angered, such punishment will not bring about any good results. Indeed, such punishment will be harmful for both, parents and children.

With these principles in mind you must be on your guard against two mistakes made all too frequently.

The one is to punish a child in a spirit of revenge.

We all know very well that parents often become vexed. Their patience is tried and tested every day. They may just have finished a very practical instruction or lesson of some kind, they may have warned ever so often not to do some certain thing—and there, hardly are they through with their last word—the child is at it again. The child acts as unconcernedly and foolishly as though it had never heard any advice, or received any command. That parents are tempted to punish a child right then and there more in a spirit of provocation than with a purpose of correction goes without saying. It is here that parents must control themselves. They must by all means wait until their temper has cooled down, before they attempt to punish the child. The very fact that the child is unable to reason perfectly, should urge the parents to use judgment in dealing out punishment. Even though the child is unable to reason

clearly, it will to some extent be able to measure the ill will of its parents, and in this manner connects the punishment and the anger of parents. Instead of being made to acknowledge its wrong, it will only see the anger of a father, and the punishment he administers because he is angry. And the child often bears a grudge for its life. Such punishment, far from correcting a wrong, will only tend to confirm a child in wrong doing. It will try to do some forbidden thing, not because it sees a wrong in the thing itself, but simply because father gets angry when he finds out.

Such bringing up of children is a sad error that will have tears and sorrow in store for parents and children in the years to come.

If, for some reason or other, you grow angry at a child, and since you are human it is natural for you to lose your patience, wait until your exasperation has given room to calmness. Then punish the child, but neither more nor less than its deed deserves. When the child is punished, explain why you have to punish it. A punishment loses half its good effect when the proper explanation is wanting. Let the child feel and understand that every evil action calls for punishment, because God has set down certain rules for us to obey or to take the consequences. Lessons from Bible History and from the Lives of Saints will fit in well in these instructions, to show the ways God has of punishing mankind. You may add other experiences, from what you have seen and heard in your days, to make these instructions more impressive. Since all successful child-training is inseparable from faith, you must work into your instructions the law of God. Explain to the child that God would rather reward than punish, but that He has to punish in order to remain just; that in like manner you, as representatives of God, must punish evil actions, although you would rather not punish so far as you are concerned. You punish because God commands you

to punish wrong, and if you should fail in this duty God will punish not only the children but the parents as well, and God's punishments are greatly harder to bear than those given by parents.

When a child has had such instructions—and they cannot be repeated any too often, and when it knows and feels every act of disobedience calls for punishment, it will gradually begin to connect acts of disobedience with the punishments that will follow, and decide that it is far better to be obedient than to disobey and take inevitable punishment. This is, indeed, the very first and most important lesson a child must learn. Our sorrow for sin is at the start not perfect by any means. Even we adults begin with imperfect contrition for our sins, the dread of eternal punishment, and from this we endeavor to aspire to the highest motive, the love of God, perfect contrition. The mind of the child has to undergo a like process. You cannot expect the child from the very first start to be obedient out of pure love for you. That will come in due season, after the child has learned the meaning of sorrow, pain and punishment.

When the doctor gives you for a certain ailment a box of fifty pills, one to be taken after each meal, you do not expect to be cured after taking the very first pill. In all probability you will have to take most of the fifty, and perhaps more, before the doctor will say that you have completely recovered. In a like manner you, fathers of families, must never think that one instruction or one punishment will mean that you have done your duty. Until the child is thoroughly cured of its evil ways it is your duty to continue the treatment best suited to reform the child.

The other mistake you must avoid is idle threats. Very often you hear parents threaten their children with all kinds of horrible punishments. Fairy tales are made use of to frighten the children.

One hears mothers threaten that the policeman will take naughty children; but the children soon learn that this talk is an idle threat. There are those who threaten impossible punishments, such as burning a hole in the tongue with a hot iron for telling lies or for saying naughty words; but the same words and lies are repeated and no such thing happens. That sort of threat is entirely useless. Other parents will call their children names, even swear at them and threaten all kinds of things, without of course ever carrying out any threat.

That such useless warnings and threats are utterly wrong and useless ought to be apparent to all. Yet there are countless fathers and mothers who try to enforce good behavior by threats which they know they cannot and will not carry out. Soon they become powerless, for their children have become their masters. The children grow up and only smile when their parents threaten and rave. And then parents wonder how it is that they cannot make their children mind.

Punishment, as has been said, should always fit the act of disobedience. It should never be more nor less than the fault deserves. And to make your warnings effective you must be truthful. Never threaten to punish in a way you cannot and will not carry out. Whatever the nature of punishment may be, whether in the nature of depriving the children of some plaything, or some meal, or whether it be in the nature of corporal punishment—whenever you threaten a certain punishment for some certain act of disobedience, or a lie or impertinence, carry out your threat if the warning is not heeded. Children must understand that you mean every word you say to them, that if you threaten any kind of punishment for acts of disobedience or naughtiness it is certain that the punishment will be administered if called for. There will be no

trouble convincing them of your earnestness if you let them know and feel that you are true to your word.

The Holy Ghost tells us: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." Parental authority must not be empty words for children but wholesome fear. As the fear of God's punishments induces us to avoid them, so in a similar manner parental authority must be of such a character that children will really fear it. When children dread to offend their parents for fear of being punished, and try to please them to gain their good will, you have true discipline as a starter, and you are in position to really train your children in the way of the Lord.

XL. The Authority of God

Since there can be no real moral training without religion, it is absolutely necessary for parents to constantly refer to God as the highest authority in all the matters in which they demand obedience from their children. If children see only the authority of parents they are inclined to suspect in the commands an arbitrary will, ordering this or that just because parents happen to want things their own way.

From this viewpoint parental authority would mean nothing to children but to humor parents by obedience when this appears advisable to them, or of not obeying when it can be done with impunity. To avoid such a dangerous notion begin as early as possible to teach the little child about God as much as it may be able to grasp.

When your little baby was baptized, God remembered it. He implanted in that young soul priceless gifts, the virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity. No sooner does the mind and will of that little child begin to be active, when those Divine virtues begin to operate. The child needs no learned proofs about the existence of God. It hears you speak of God, how great, how wonderful, how mighty, how loving He is, and the child listens in awe and wonderment and simply believes. You tell the little one about the Guardian Angel, how this bright spirit is sent by God to take care of the little child and the child believes. No argument and no proof is asked. Faith begins to work in its own way. You tell the child how God rewards the good and punishes evil; you speak of Heaven as the home of God, where He takes all those who serve Him faithfully on earth and Hope begins to well up in the heart of the little child. There is a longing for Heaven, to

be with God and the angels and Saints, and, if proper instructions are given, the child will try to do all it can that one day God may take it to Heaven. You tell the little child about the goodness of God. His patience and love, and without further argument the child will perform an act of love in its heart, before having learned to say the acts of Faith, Hope and Charity. This is what the grace of God accomplishes in the souls of your little children. All that is required of you is that you give this work of God a start at the proper time, by speaking to the little ones about God.

So wonderful is the working of grace in the hearts and minds of your little children that they fairly thirst for knowledge about God and holy things. Imagine then how grieved a little child must feel when to questions about God or the angels a gruff father or an indifferent mother answers curtly "don't bother me." To fight against the grace of God, in ourselves or in others, is the worst of sins that can be committed. Instead of suppressing this pious curiosity of children, you should try studiously to nourish and develop it so that the child's dawn of reason may be graced by the awakening of faith. And faith, like a flower, must be nourished.

As long as your child is unable to properly take care of its faith, it is *your* duty as fathers to see that its faith is nourished. Faith, as St. Paul says, comes from hearing. It is your duty to explain to the child the fundamental and the most necessary truths of our holy Faith.

If the child is told about God, and His laws and ways, it soon comes to understand that it is not only father or mother but God who is pleased when it behaves well, and that it offends God above all whenever it is ill behaved. Then the child begins to see that it is God Himself who commands us to be obedient, to pray, to tell the truth, and so forth, and it sees the commands of parents

in another light. It discovers that the commands of parents are not simply forbidding or ordering one thing or another. It begins to connect the laws of God with the commands of parents and sees they are exactly alike. What God commands the child to do or avoid, is exactly what the parents command it to do or avoid. So it understands that God and parents are one in authority, and this is a most essential lesson for children to learn.

The most successful in training children are they who by proper instruction are able to make themselves, as it were, identical with God in all they command and forbid.

That parents may be able to identify themselves with God in behalf of their children,—and they actually represent God in their care of children, they must first of all be living examples in all the things they expect their children to do. If they expect their children to be obedient, they must show the virtue of obedience in their own life. For instance, going to church on Sundays may be pointed out to the children as a lesson of how parents must be obedient to God. When the child sees such obedience in its parents it will not seem so much of a task and burden for it to be obedient. If the child is told not to lie or say bad words, and yet parents are found to do these very things, the child will have its very first doubts. These doubts will undermine the faith in God, and the respect for parental authority.

In order, then, that parents may link their authority with that of God they are required to lead blameless, holy lives, so that their children may learn the lessons of life in the example of their parents. Children do more thinking than we might think. They will study the actions of their parents and make their own comparison between what parents command and do, and what God commands. The child that watches the acts of parents and sees

that they are obedient to God will blush with shame to think of its own acts of disobedience. While it feels humiliated over its own shortcoming, its respect and love for parents rises higher and higher. Nor will the child stop there. It will strive earnestly to become as good as the parents, because it recognizes the identity of parental and Divine authority. That a child may forget itself from time to time, and do wrong on the impulse of the moment, is not to be considered as malice, but as simple frailty, since even we, who are fully matured mentally, are likely to sin. Parents will then however impose some sort of punishment to suit the nature of the offense.

The proper training of children requires good judgment, patience, zeal and perseverance.

Where parents fail to identify themselves with God in what they forbid and command, the training of children will be a failure. Children will be insubordinate, they will have no respect for any sort of authority. The spirit of the times and many other things will often be blamed for faults in children which are due to nothing else but the wrong method and the bad example of parents.

Water will always seek its own level.

And that principle holds good of children. Children will hardly ever be better than their parents. Children will be disobedient because they see their parents breaking the commandments of God; they will be quarrelsome if they see father and mother quarrel, they will be telling falsehoods because they learn it from their parents; they will be headstrong if they see that father and mother try at all times to have the last word in an argument; they will use foul language, indecent words and expressions, and will curse and profane the holy Name of God, if they hear this sort of talk at home; they will read books and papers such as they should never even know of,

because parents keep them on the sitting-room table, where there should be none but good Catholic books and papers. And then such worthless parents will complain about their children! One cannot gather grapes from thorns, or figs from thistles. It requires a good tree to bring forth good fruit. The parents must be saintly if the children are to grow up in the fear of God.

Saintliness in parents is an absolutely necessary condition for successful child-training. You can never impress it too much upon the dawning mind of your children that what you bid them to do is exactly what God Himself wants them to do, that it is really God speaking to them whenever you order or forbid them to do something. Especially when the child is inclined to stubbornness must this lesson be thoroughly brought home to them. The stubbornness of the child must be met and overcome by the greater and stronger insistence of the parents. Is it thinkable that God will yield to our wrong doing in a single thing? The fact that we stubbornly insist upon doing evil will never for a moment make God yield in any of His Commandments. He meets our stubbornness with His absolute will and, if we insist upon doing wrong, we must be prepared to take the punishment He has decreed for it. This is God's way of dealing with us, His children. Can parents think of a more perfect way of dealing with their children? If God's way is the right way, are parents doing right in yielding to children and permit them to do wrong just because it is hard to be insistent? By the very fact of yielding to the wrongdoing of their children parents become partners in it and are guilty before God for having failed in one of their most solemn duties.

Learn, then, from this that you make your authority over your children identical with the authority of God. Whatever you command them to do they must see you do yourselves. And the wrong you forbid them to do they must not see you do, either.

XLI. School Years

If the suggestions of the preceding conferences are acted upon, the child will have grasped the principal truths of our holy Faith before it begins to attend the parish school. The remaining task will be comparatively easy if the foundations have been carefully laid at home.

With school age the child passes to another stage of growth and development. And this growth is to take place not only physically but spiritually as well. The two must keep an even pace. And hence Catholic parents are in conscience bound to send their children to the Catholic school. There is no need of repeating here what has been said in former conferences regarding the evils of a non-religious education. Let me say only that Catholic parents who do not send their children to a parish school, wherever this can be done, are not worthy of the honor of being parents. And there is a severe reckoning awaiting them when they are called before the Divine Judge.

God bless the Catholic parents who bring great sacrifices that their children may have the benefit of a parish school education. It has been my good fortune to come in contact with some conscientious parents who sold good farms in order to be able to move near a Catholic Church and school. I might also mention the experience of a real estate agent who complained that in a certain town he could not sell any property to Catholics because there was no Catholic school there. God will bless parents who place faith and the spiritual welfare of their children above all temporal considerations.

To make school-work the success it deserves to be it will be

necessary to have home and school work hand in hand. What is law in the one must be law in the other. Children must learn that the Sisters have the same authority in school that parents have at home. They should understand that they must be as obedient in school as they are at home, because such is the will of God. Here is one reason, by the way, why the school fails to benefit some children. At home these children can do as they like; they are the masters at home. In school they are made to obey, and that is looked upon by these children and, indeed, by their parents, as an unwarranted restraint.

You must tell your children that they have to be obedient in school because the Sisters take the place of the parents. Parents should take a lively interest in the work of their children at school. They should know the Sisters personally, and inquire from time to time how the children get along in studies and conduct. Nearly every parish school issues a monthly report card. That should be looked over carefully each month, and if the children have at any time lower marks than the month before, the parents should inquire for the reason. Something must be done to prevent such falling back. Find out the fault and try to remedy it. There may be various reasons why children make a poor showing. It may be that they are not well; perhaps their eyes or their teeth are in poor condition. They must be looked after. May be the child is extremely nervous. Some will know their lessons perfectly well at home, yet the moment they come to school their mind is a blank. The fault may be that the children are not given enough time to study their lessons at home. It is utterly impossible for children to make real progress if they do not spend a certain time at home every day to prepare the lessons they are to recite the next day. Lessons should be learned by heart at home. When the children come to

school they recite the lessons and have them explained. That is what school and teachers are for. Again, it may be that children do not attend school regularly. School-work is calculated for ten months of work each year. It stands to reason that if a child only attends school for five months, and is absent the rest of the time, it cannot do the work of ten months' time. Finally, there may be another reason, why your children are behind in their studies, and that is their lack of attention when lessons are explained. When they should pay attention to what is being explained, they may be secretly doing something else, and may disturb other children and thus interfere with the work of the entire class. Needless to say, all children are not equally bright. If some of them reach up to eighty per cent. they do their very best. In conduct, however, there is no reason why even the dullest child should not have hundred per cent.

The monthly report card contains, as you see, very valuable information for parents, and nothing will help so much in promoting the success of the parish school than a strict attention to the monthly report card of your children.

While you should not encourage your children to carry tales, it is your business to know what is going on in school. You must get your children to tell you if anything wrong happens, but for the behavior of your children your source of information must be the teachers. The School Sisters are sent by their superiors to take charge of the school and of your children. They are strangers to you, yet, they have the welfare of your children at heart, not for the sake of a handsome salary, but for the love of God. The little pay they receive just about suffices for keeping them in clothes and of providing them with plain food. What induces these saintly women to do this work is the zeal to labor for the love of God.

Whether they have your children before them, or the children of Indians and Negroes makes no difference to them. In all children they see souls for the love of which the Son of God came down upon this earth to suffer and die.

The only motive these nuns have of taking charge of your children is the love of God. If they were after money they would follow some other calling in the world.

With their experience in child training it will not take School Sisters very long to find out both the good and the bad points of your children. In all probability they can give you a number of pointers about child training you never thought of before. It is their effort, as it should be yours, to bring out the very best in your children, and the difficulty of this work will be realized by you if you take the necessary interest in the school work of your children, and from time to time consult with the Sisters about the methods to be employed in order to give the children proper encouragement.

Unless home and school work hand in hand, the efforts of either will be of no avail. It will be impossible for Sisters to remedy any faults of children if these faults are permitted at home. Children will look upon the school as a place of uncomfortable restraint if they cannot act as independently there as at home. Both at home and in school obedience is the chief condition of success. See to it that the children mind their teachers. There will be little trouble making them obey in school if they are taught to obey at home.

As has been said before, no one expects every child to get a hundred per cent. at school. Some children will know a lesson by reading it over once. I always consider such a gift a doubtful benefit, for unless the child is diligent at the same time, that ease of learning will be often a drawback. Give me the child that must

make an effort to remember a lesson. That child will often make headway in life where the overbright child will fail. After all, it is not so much natural gift as solid work that counts in life. When one of your children is particularly bright, see to it that it will not grow careless on that account; make it work so much harder at a problem or a composition. Such a child is easily spoiled by flattery. Teach it diligence and thoroughness in work. Always point out where there is room for improvement, to prevent the child from being easily satisfied with its efforts. A child that is slow in understanding a lesson, or one that is nervous, must be treated with a great deal of patience. Make it recite its lesson at home, explain a lesson at home as well as you can and give it more leisure for study than to others who learn a lesson more quickly.

It is best to appoint a certain time every day for home studies, not less than one hour. When the children return from school give them some housework to do. That itself will be relaxation for them. Give them some time to play, and see to it that they study their lessons. At eight in the evening they should say their night prayers and go to bed. Such sort of a rule should be observed *strictly* and at all times, excepting only times of sickness.

The children themselves will some day thank you for it if you have trained them to a life of order. It will not be necessary to explain to them now the benefits of such a life of order; they may not even understand the necessity or benefit. What will be necessary is that they are made to live up to the rules you make for them, and that you are strict in having them observed.

XLII. Mistakes in Dealing With Children

There are parents who make the mistake of invariably taking their children's part. They positively refuse to admit that their children can do wrong.

"Here, Willie, dear; here, Charley, dear," such a mother will say to her boys, "did you break a window as this man says?" Without even blushing the two dear boys will lie like veterans, and the indignation of the mother grows in consequence. "There, you see," she will tell you, "I knew you were mistaken the moment you began to speak, for we are bringing up our boys to be gentlemen and not rowdies. My boys have a good bringing-up, and the window breaking is none of their work." And no evidence or witness can convince the mother that the boys committed the bad deed. And in the evening when the father comes home from his work his wife tells him of the cruel injustice to which their darling sons have been exposed. And the father puts on his hat and coat and calls on the man who so wickedly slandered his virtuous boys. He wants to see the man who will dare to accuse his boys or lay a hand upon them.

You do not realize how many such parents we have. It happens very seldom that parents will admit the wrongdoing of their children. Between the lies the children will tell and the blindness of their parents it is next to impossible to convince *some* parents of the evil that their children do.

A boy does not behave in school or in church. He has been found guilty of misdeeds, not only once, but many times. Finally the Sister sees that the boy must be punished, because the rest of the

pupils would suffer if this boy could go on with impunity. So he is given some punishment. He goes home crying most pitifully. The anxious mother asks what is the matter with her darling boy, and he says he was chastised by the Sister. Think of the audacity: a stranger to lay hands on her innocent boy! She asks her dear boy what he might have done to be treated with such severity, and he says he did not do anything he could think of to deserve such punishment. The mother is undecided whether she should keep the boy from school or whether to sue the Sister. She will wait till father comes home from work. When he hears of the cruel injustice, his ire is aroused. He calls on the Sister who forgot herself so as to lay hands upon his innocent boy and warns her, "Don't you ever dare to touch my boy again."

In all probability the Sister will do as told, and the boy will be spoiled. Very likely he will finally be expelled from the school as the only alternative to save the morals of the other children. There can be no order or discipline where one or more children are made favorites. All must be treated alike, and if any one of them deserves punishment he must receive it, no matter who he is.

What are you to do, when a child comes home and complains of having been punished? Let the child tell his story, and after all has been said take that dear boy over your knee and administer a supplementary spanking from the viewpoint that the Sister punished not without good reason, and not as severely as she should have punished. This treatment will invariably be a complete cure for complaints. The child learns a very wholesome lesson. He begins to grasp that he has to behave, no matter where it is. The surest way of spoiling a child is to take his part in all things.

The Sisters in school must deal with all classes of children. To manage forty or more children in one class-room means that order

must be strictly observed. Moreover, children are observing. They want to be treated alike, as justice demands it. If one boy can cut up everlastingly just because his father "dares any man to lay hands upon his good boy," the order of the whole class-room is upset. The Sisters must be fair to *all* children or they forfeit their confidence. Can you expect Sisters to risk the welfare of a whole class of forty or fifty children just because there is a bad boy whose foolish parents want him to have his way?

The proper way for parents is to never take the word of their children when they meet with trouble at school. Investigate the matter thoroughly to know the whole truth. If in ascertaining the truth you catch your children in a lie, give them such punishment that they will never attempt to deceive you again. If upon investigation you discover that your child was not altogether to blame, do not even then take sides with it, because by undermining the authority of the school you undermine your own authority. Your child must learn that it can never expect any sympathy from you, if on its own accord it gets into trouble. It will then do all it can to keep out of trouble. It will soon learn that by minding its business and doing its duty at all times it gets along best. Then the child learns a valuable lesson for all its life. The trouble-maker, and he who constantly looks for trouble, will always find more trouble than they bargain for.

Never for a moment imagine you are helping your children by siding with them against the teachers. You are *not* helping your children at all; you only make them the worse for it. You confirm them in their bad behavior, and it may happen that you get the punishment you should have given your children.

Quarrels and petty fights among children, boys especially, are hardly to be entirely prevented. These little fights will not be so

bad. As a rule boys will be the best friends after they had their little fight.

But be careful not to let your boys become quarrelsome; do not tolerate bad temper, animosity, and contentiousness. Of course, you should think the world of your children; they should by all means be better than the children of parents who know nothing of God and His holy law. But, if you are wise, you will never praise your children when they are in hearing distance. That will only tend to spoil them. They would soon get a very exalted opinion of themselves. While they may be praised and given credit for particular good actions, they should be made to realize their shortcomings as well, partly for the sake of learning the lesson of true humility, and partly for the purpose of trying to overcome their faults.

And let it never be said of you that you question the right of the Sisters in conducting the school as they see fit. Support them in whatever they do for the temporal and spiritual welfare of your little ones, and always bear in mind that your children are not angels. We all share alike in the weakness and frailty of human nature, and all of us must fight and struggle hard to overcome our failings.

XLIII. The Training for Work

Since work is the unavoidable burden and duty of man, it will be a serious charge against parents if they permit their children to grow up without the least knowledge of work. There is an old saying that all work and no play makes of Jack a dull boy; but it is a greater truth that all play and no work will make of Jack a scamp.

Personally I think we give children too much time for play and not enough work. The present-day movement for playgrounds and recreation for children deserves support only if it does not go so far as to let children get the notion that all they are in this world for is to play and to seek amusement and ease. Even studies are made into play to render them more enjoyable, and then, when life begins to impose duties of hard work, these children have received the false notion that work is something to be shunned.

Twenty years or so ago girls were already with the age of twelve made to go out and do housework, or else do housework at home. Now our girls go to high-school until old enough to marry. They know Latin and Greek, but they know nothing of housework. Mother is there to do the work, but the girls are ladies and must not be asked to do anything so vulgar as housework. Boys are equally unfit for real work. Many of them go to highschool or college simply for the sake of being on the football or baseball team. From their fourteenth year on most of them should learn an honest trade. Instead of that the most important years of their lives are wasted, and when later the force of circumstances compels them to work they will find life an extremely severe and distasteful school.

The same as you parents are bound to work, so in their turn your children will have to work in their day. This truth cannot be taught any too soon.

Now, if you are wise parents you will have considered this question and decided what kind of work, and how much of it, should be expected of your children every day. A sensible mother will know what work her little girl can and ought to do regularly. Common sense tells us not to expect as much of a seven-year-old child as of one that is ten or twelve. Again, if a child is frail, a sensible parent will not burden it with an undue amount of work. But apart from these conditions, both boys and girls should be given some regular work around the house, so as to make them become accustomed to real work.

Here it is where parents are to teach their children one of the most important lessons of life: the necessity of work.

In the early teens boys are hardest to manage, if they are not taken in charge by a sensible father.

The animal spirits of the boy fairly bubble over; he begins to realize his strength and wants to make use of it. Hence the common thing of boys fighting, destroying property, and so on. You need not altogether suppress this life in the boy, for that would be criminal; but you should direct that boyish impulse and high spirit into proper channels. Make the boy acquainted with saw and ax to split wood for his mother. Make him help mother in hard work, such as beating carpets and such things. Allow him some time for play, but make him understand that work comes first. Only after his work is well done can he hope to play with other boys. One of the best lessons for a boy is to make him actually earn a few pennies for himself, so that he may learn the value of a dollar. The newsboy who must walk four or five miles every day to earn a few pen-

nies knows the value of a dollar. He knows how he has to hustle to earn it. The very fact that he must work for his few cents will make him think better of his money than to spend it foolishly. The boy who does not know what work means will not know the value of money.

The boy who has to sell papers has the makings of being one day a successful man of business, while the boy who wastes his time in high-school without talent and earnest study may become his clerk.

While your children are mastering the elementary branches of learning in the parish school, do not forget that you also are their teachers. Teach your children that manual labor is no dishonor. Arrange their time for play, work and study so that each of the three get their proper time.

Nowadays we often hear it said that an education is the best gift parents can bestow upon their children.

It depends upon the children and upon the education whether this is true or not. To send a dull child to a high-school and college is a waste of time, of money and effort. Many a skilful and successful blacksmith or carpenter is lost to the world because the boy whose proper vocation this trade would be, is turned into an incompetent lawyer or doctor, who, owing to his lack of knowledge and fitness, is unable to make a living. Such failures in the ranks of the professions often enter upon a dishonest way of making a living. For such men the education they received without being able to digest it was a curse. A higher education is *not* always the greatest good parents can give their children. The teaching of an honorable trade would be far better in many cases. But in our present day educational standards have been so dreadfully twisted that people disdain the idea of being wage-earners. People ignore the fact that handsome wages are far better than a meagre salary. Yet this age im-

presses young men and young women with the thought that wages are beneath their dignity. They are entitled to nothing less than a "salary," even though it be less than the amount a mechanic gets in wages.

An education that prevents the child from acquiring a love for work, that does not train it for the work the coming years will demand of it, leads only to rank failure. A story from my experience will illustrate this truth far better than any abstract lecture on education.

A certain hard-working man had by thrift and hard work advanced his family from poverty to wealth. There were two children, a boy and a girl. Other children had died in infancy. Both boy and girl were given—what their parents thought the best they could give them—an education, and eventually they went to high-school. Neither boy nor girl were very intelligent, the boy, moreover, was lazy.

The father never for a moment thought of applying to his son the rule that had been *his* rule from boyhood on—work, work and more work. His own education had been very slim. He had learned more by experience than out of books, and he foolishly thought that he was doing his son a favor by letting him have the education that had been denied to himself.

The boy grew up with the idea that he could have anything he saw or wanted, and his father humored him in this delusion. In school he was known as the son of a rich father, and hence he never lacked friends.

Well, to make a long story short, the young man was kept at high-school longer than enough to graduate, but finally his father was plainly told that there was no prospect that the boy would ever graduate. So he was taken out of high-school and sent to some

fashionable college where he received the finishing touches to take his place in select society. Now he is a living example of what such education can do for a man.

As far as his ability goes he is unable to take care of his father's business. As long as the money of his father will last this educated son will not have to worry, but after that he will not know of anything to do to make even a modest living.

His sister was as hopeless a failure at school and college as he. But she has a husband to take care of her. The important lessons she failed to learn in school she may learn from life. But her brother has no such help. He will continue to move in the best society as long as his means last, and he will avoid work as long as he can. What will then become of him, the Lord only knows.

Had the father had the common sense to apply the hard lessons of his life to his son, he would have said to his son when he was fourteen years old: "Now, son, when I was your age I started work as an office boy. I swept the office, dusted the furniture, did errands and worked my way up, till one day the firm I worked for changed their sign by adding my name to it, and finally I bought out my partners. Now you go and start out in the same way. You can do better than I did, for you have me to look out for you, whereas my father died when I was eight years old. Mother had no money to send me to school. But you see what work got for me. Now go and try your luck." That would have been sensible talk. Alas! it never was said.

Parents are really guilty of a crime against their children if they do not teach them the necessity and dignity of labor.

Think of the humble home of the Holy Family in Nazareth.

St. Joseph fully understood that Jesus was the Son of the living God. St. Joseph understood the Divine mission of Jesus, as the

Saviour and Redeemer of mankind. Yet, in his simplicity of heart he teaches the boy Jesus the trade his own father had taught him.

If we admire the humble zeal of St. Joseph, in teaching the Son of God the carpenter trade, what can we say of the humble submission of dear Jesus, who consented that His sacred Hands should become hardened and calloused with work?

If Jesus did not consider it beneath His dignity to learn an humble trade, can your son object if you teach him how to work?

Bear in mind the example of good St. Joseph, and bring to your own home the lesson of work, that your children may one day do the work, faithfully and ably, for which God has intended them.

XLIV. Annoyances

The proper training of children demands that parents show a proper regard for each other's authority. They should not call each other familiarly by their first names but, for the sake of the children, they should address each other as "father" and "mother."

When children begin to come to a married couple, there will come with them divers and many annoyances for fathers and mothers; they will have to bear them patiently, for there are no honors but with them come burdens. Fathers and mothers must live in constant restraint. Never should the children hear or see anything of their parents that might in the least detract from the love or reverence they owe them. Hence quarreling, faultfinding and scolding are out of place between parents in the presence of children. Fathers and mothers are human, they are liable to err, but if you, parents, have any fault to find, discuss the matter when you are alone. Wait until the children are asleep, or at school, before you discuss differences of opinion. Always try to smoothen out differences and little difficulties in a spirit of charity and patience. There may be another child resting beneath the heart of your wife, and for that reason, too, it is very important for both of you to treat each other with true love and charity, in order not to put a blight upon the life that is yet unborn.

Parental duties call for many sacrifices, many more than you ever thought you should be asked to make in the name of love. But such is life, and you must make the best of it.

The proper training of children with its many little annoyances is by many looked upon as useless; yet, for their future life, if you put yourselves in the place of children, you will see how great an influence this training has upon the years that are to come.

As the child is obliged to learn, so you are obliged to teach. And the sort of teaching you are to do may appear monotonous to you, but it is not so for the child. It must appear monotonous to you to repeat the same thing many times, but the child needs that constant repetition, for its memory is not as retentive as is yours. And if it is easy even for you to forget things, can you expect more of a child?

A child learns by having the same lesson told over and over again.

To illustrate.

The child must be taught not to steal. It must be taught that stealing is a sin which God has forbidden, a sin which God will punish. To bring this lesson home to the child you cannot talk in an abstract manner about the rights of property, or the duty of restitution, it would be a waste of time and breath. In the first place, one explanation will never be enough, and, furthermore, the child cannot understand abstract things, such as sin, rights of property, restitution, and so on. The child, not knowing the nature or value of property, must be trained not to take or even touch anything without first asking the parents. That of course will mean annoyance and bother for parents; but in later years it will be proven that this is the only method by which you can teach the child not to steal.

A little child, unable to reason, will want everything in sight. It is not that it has any clear idea of the use or benefit of the object it sees; but from inborn selfishness it wants all it sees. This is a thing parents must not tolerate. To humor a child in its selfishness is to make of it a thief. Instead the child must be made to feel that it is utterly dependent upon parents for all its wants. That is the lesson the child must learn early, and you, fathers, are to teach that lesson.

To convey this lesson you must never permit the child to help itself at table or anywhere else. Make it say "please" when it wants anything, and "thank you" when it has received something. At meals give it a proper portion and never permit it to help itself. Should it require a second helping, make it ask and thank you for it. Care should be taken that the child will not waste food or play with it, for food has not been given to us to play with. Under no consideration must children be allowed to help themselves to food in the pantry or money from the parental pocketbook.

Some will say it is a nuisance to make children ask for all they want or need. Why not let children help themselves? Food is there to be eaten; why bother about having children tagging after you for every bit of food? Of course this would save bother and annoyance, but there would be no training of the children and the most valuable lessons they are to receive in that tender age would never be given. No doubt, children would help themselves only too gladly to all the good things they see. But there is the danger that they might overlook the meaning of "thine and mine."

If you allow children to help themselves they get the idea they can take anything they like. Which child is likely to go to a grocery and take an apple from the counter: the child that says to its parents "please may I have an apple," or the child that is accustomed to help itself at home? The well-trained child will never dare to touch a thing it does not first ask for. It thoroughly learns by example the lesson: "thou shalt not steal."

Another child will know it can have all it wants. All that is needed is to help itself. If its parents don't care what the child takes, why should others care? This child is taught to steal and the parents are the teachers.

Whatever is worth while doing is worth while doing well. Hence

do not look so much at inconveniences and annoyances as upon the good results that will come from conscientious training.

Insist upon children asking and thanking you for things they want. It also teaches them good manners. Give your children whatever you think is proper. If they ask for something you cannot give them, or something that would be injurious for them, you may give them something else of benefit to them. You must make them understand they cannot have everything they see. The selfishness of children cannot be curbed by petting them. There are times when parents must say a very strong "no" and stick to it.

Many times children are unreasonable in their wants. Unless parents are there to control their wants, where should it end? Is not the spirit of waste and extravagance of our day proof enough that wilful waste makes woeful want? Why have we so many young thieves and juvenile courts? Boys and girls have become experienced shoplifters and daylight burglars. Would many of these unfortunate children be what they are if they had been trained to ask for things at home?

Children *are* unreasonable in many things and they must be cured of that habit in time. And the best method is the good old-fashioned method of making the children say "please" for whatever they want, of training them not to touch what does not belong to them.

It will pay you in a thousand ways to make the children ask for whatever they need, whether food, clothing, books or whatever else it may be.

Some people think such a custom is positively absurd, incompatible with our advanced ideas of education and all that. Give children all they want or, rather, let them help themselves! They will know when they have enough. How should *we* like to have

to ask someone for a slice of bread when we are hungry! Such is their reasoning.

But let me call your attention to God's way of doing. Does not He, who knows all things, know what we need? And yet this all-knowing God makes us ask for what we need, for body and soul. God knows our wants far better than we do, especially our spiritual wants; yet, God wants us to pray for all we need. God requires our prayer to remind us of our dependence upon Him for all we are and have. We know we depend upon God for all things; yet even we must be reminded of this fact. Must not the children be reminded then of their dependence upon their parents? Will it hurt the children to learn they must not crave for things they cannot have? Will it hurt children to learn that they must not even touch things that do not belong to them? If you think these are good lessons for your children, teach these lessons constantly and thoroughly.

You, fathers, take the place of God with your children and therefore you must rule them with the authority of God and in the name of God.

XLV. Responsibility

Dwelling further upon the similarity between God's authority and the authority of a father over his children it is understood that you spare no efforts in order to impress upon your children the fact that they must mind your just commands as though God were speaking to them instead of you. God has placed you over your children and has given you the privilege to exact obedience from them in His name. If you misuse the privilege you will suffer for it.

It is natural for children to place their parents in a class by themselves. They get to know other people, relatives, neighbors, and strangers, but their parents seem like superior beings to them. If your personal conduct justifies this opinion their acts of obedience will be all the more sincere.

Many parents of our day have a wrong way of exacting obedience from their children. No effort is made to teach the child the relation between God and parents, and then obedience becomes a matter of convenience. The easier to get obedience from their children parents will bribe them to obey. A penny is given them for going an errand or getting something from another room or place. This is one of the worst habits children can be given. It robs obedience of all that is good in it.

You will find children so thoroughly spoiled they will not move a finger unless a penny or some other reward is forthcoming. They will go to the grocery or meat market only if you pay them for it. If no gain is in sight they will not bother about obedience. Indeed parents are made to feel that their children are doing them a favor by taking the money. A mother may be tired from her daily work, but—no money, no errand. What understanding of obedience has

been given to such a child! And how can a child have a right idea about obedience if it is not taught rightly by its parents? Children should be made to obey, not for a reward, but because God commands them to obey.

This is not the only bad feature about the bribing of children. By giving them money for being obedient, children learn to spend money instead of to save money. And here we have reached a very important matter.

In nine cases out of ten, children who get such pennies will make a trip to the candy store to spend that money for sweets. And we find parents idiotic enough to encourage children in this pernicious practice.

Your parents had far better means for making *you* obey. They did not have to show you a penny to make you go to the grocery. When your parents told you to do something they saw to it that you did what you were told. You know what happened to you if you did not do as you were told.

There was no need of bribing *you* to be obedient. As a result you did not learn to spend money before you could earn it. When children have learned how to earn and save money the spending will take care of itself.

The little toy bank some children have is not a very good way of teaching them to save. The money put in these receptacles is in the children's mind connected with the idea of spending it for something just as soon as the amount becomes worth while. A far better plan will be to open a bank account for your children. Give them a real bank book, of some bank in your town, and give them the chance of seeing their little savings grow. That will teach them to save what pennies and nickels they are occasionally given and will cause them a constant joy. I know newsboys who have

saved several hundred dollars with the help of a bank book. These are not the boys who wear their shoes off running to the store to get candy for their penny. They will be successful men of business when they are grown up, and the boy who spends every penny for candy may have to apply for a job as teamster or laborer to the erstwhile newsboy.

While relating reminiscences the governor of one of our states related how he came to get his first wheel. He had seen other young men riding wheels and concluded that it was easier than walking. So he simply asked his father to buy a wheel for him. And his father answered: "I could buy you a wheel as well as not; but you would think hardly more of it than if I bought you a five-cent whistle. I'll tell you what I will do. You see yonder wood-pile? Split this wood and pile it up nicely and I will give you what I would have to give any workingman. And since that will not be enough to buy a wheel with, you get busy peddling papers. Whatever you earn will be yours. When you have earned enough money to buy a wheel, go and get one."

Well, the governor said, he got busy at once. Soon he had earned enough money to buy a wheel, but he really felt sorry to part with his entire savings for a wheel. So he first saved up another fifty dollars that he might have a nest egg for the future and then bought his wheel. With the wheel he knew he could get more customers for his papers, and whenever he saw a way to earn five cents he did not think, oh well, it is only a nickle, and pass it by. Not he; he knew how much five cents a day would amount to in a week, a month, a year, and he went after that nickle. That was the good start he was given in his life.

And the wheel; you should have seen it. A delicate baby could not have been cared for more lovingly than was that same wheel.

He never permitted dust or mud to settle on it. He had paid for that wheel, and knew how hard it was to earn the money. That is the reason he took mighty good care of it.

Now let us suppose the father of the governor had said: "Well, son, I don't see why you shouldn't have a wheel like the other fellows have. We have the money and why shouldn't we show that we have it. Just go to town and pick out the best you see and tell them to charge it to me." Would that have made a governor of the boy?

In the first place the boy would not have learned the value of money. He would have been given the idea that his father had an inexhaustible amount of money to buy anything and everything he wanted. If you could trace to its first source the reckless spending of many of our young men, you would find that their own parents taught them how to spend money, but not how to save nor how to earn it.

Go and stand in front of a candy store and see the children rushing in to exchange their pennies for sweets. In many cases they are not the children of well-to-do parents. They are mostly of the poorer working classes; but these children are taught to spend a penny as fast as they get it, because the parents themselves have not learned even the rudiments of saving. Again, take a look into a pool room. As yet the young spenders are not old enough to be admitted to the liquor store, but they must have some place where, like fools, they may part with their money. The candy store is no longer a place of charm for them, and the law forbids their admission to the saloon. So they go to a pool room to get rid of their money.

Eventually these young men become twenty-one years of age and they graduate from the pool room to the saloon. Now they are real

men. They can squirt tobacco juice, they can curse in a language so foul that older scamps envy them, they spend money freely whenever they can get it, and work as little as possible.

If you fathers don't want your boys to drift into this set of loafers do not spoil them by teaching them how to spend money before they are taught how to earn and save it.

Above all, do not begin to bribe your children with pennies in order to make them mind you, with the idea of teaching them to save these pennies. Relatives, neighbors and other friends will occasionally give your children a few pennies as an inducement to save money. Opportunities present themselves to your children times without number to earn a penny or more for some little help they may render. It will be *your* duty to see that this money is not spent foolishly. If they deserve a little candy now and then as a reward for good behavior—and provided you can afford to buy it—buy them some, and you do the buying. But under no condition let children spend money before they can earn and save it. Let them find out the benefit of earning and saving money. The spending of it will take care of itself. When a boy is old enough to work at something, whether peddling papers or any other work, give him a chance to earn some money, provided, of course, his school work will not suffer on account of it. It is not so much the amount as the lesson that is taught your son that counts. If, in the course of time, he is enabled to buy a book, or a suit of clothes, with the money he has earned, he will take better care of it than if it were given to him. Let him learn the value of a hundred cents. Teach him to value trifles. Pennies will grow into nickles, nickles into dimes, dimes into dollars, when he once knows how to save pennies.

The fact that you may have wealth is no reason why you should teach your children to be extravagant. You had to earn your

money in the sweat of your brow. You were not given an opportunity to go to the candy store to exchange your pennies for candy, you had no time to spend it in pool rooms, no time to make your home in saloons; you had to work. Now train your children in the very same way, and in the years to come your children will thank you for it.

XLVI. Order

No doubt you know of homes where you enjoy visiting, and you also know of homes where you dislike to go. Some homes you find a very Babel of confusion. The chairs are piled with hats, coats, dresses and other things. The cat occupies a warm corner on the lounge, the dog sleeps on the most comfortable chair. Wherever you go you step on some toy of the little children. One glance at the kitchen makes you resolve never to stop there for a meal. On the kitchen table, sink, and even on the floor are seen soiled pans and dishes, floors and windows are far from clean, and the table cloth on the dining-table is filthy. Better not look into the bed rooms.

Seeing such a home you ask yourselves, how can people live like that. But they do. And the furniture in many such homes is by no means cheap, nor are the people poor, and yet their home has the appearance as though they actually enjoyed living in filth. At that, the mistress of such a home complains that she works hard but is unable to keep order. When she has to work at the sewing machine she takes the pile of goods stacked there to put it on the dining-table. And when it is time to set the table the pile is put back on the sewing machine. And the children; they are a constant care and worry. Of course they must play, and mother has so many other things to do that she cannot see to it that the little ones keep their things—or themselves—in order. The bigger children come from school. They throw their things off; any convenient chair will be a good enough place. Is it to be wondered at that with such disorderly people there is a disorderly home?

You may go to another home where the furniture is not half so expensive, and yet you would far rather eat a meal with those people

because their house is clean and orderly. There may not be linoleum on the kitchen floor, but the floor is white and clean. The dining-table may be covered with a plain cloth, but it is clean. The tables and chairs are kept for the purpose for which they are intended and not as a receptacle for rubbish. Dog and cat do not occupy the best chairs in the house. There are children in that home, but they know where to find their playthings and where to put them when they get through playing; children come home from school and put their things away orderly. They know where to put them and where to find them. There is a place for everything and everything is in its place. That is an attractive home, a homelike home, though it may be ever so humble.

No doubt it is troublesome to make the children put things where they belong. But it certainly is worth the trouble because you will save time, temper, and even money, if you are orderly, and if you insist upon your children being orderly. You will, of course, provide playthings for your children. Be sure and teach them to put them away when they are not used. It will be just as easy for your children to put their dolls and games in their proper place as to throw them all over the house. Not only will this teach the children to be orderly and methodical, but it will save their playthings. They will get more pleasure out of them, and you will not have to spend money for new toys to replace those that are lost or ruined.

You are the chief teachers of your children. Teach them order and method. Assign to each of the children a certain place where they are to put school books and things. Set apart a certain place in the house where they are to have their toys and games, and a certain place for clothes, hats, and the like. From time to time go around and see whether the children keep things where they belong, whether clothing is hung up properly, whether toys are kept where they should

be, whether school books, pens and pencils are properly taken care of. If you find that the children have put everything where it belongs, that their belongings are in good condition, a little praise will be good policy. If you find carelesness, do not pick things up for the children. Call the child that has been careless and make it put the things where they belong. If you begin acting the servant for your children they will be well pleased and will let you keep that position for life.

Teach children to be lovers of order and method, and you will do them a favor, the benefit of which will last them as long as they live. They will become systematic in all they do and will thus make a success of their lives.

Needless to say, if you wish to instil a love of order in others, particularly in children, you will have to be orderly yourselves. You must give the example of order and method in your homes, because example, after all, is the best method of teaching.

XLVII. Vigilance

When you hear parents say they need no longer be watching over their children, because they are through school and now big enough and old enough to take care of themselves, and know what is right and wrong, you have parents before you who are faithless to their trust and duty. Watchfulness over children must never be relaxed and the older the children grow the more they need watching. Even when they are old enough to establish their own household the parents should watch over them in their new sphere of duties, must encourage or warn them, as the case may be, that the newly formed home may be conducted with the watchful training and conscientious care that characterized the home of the parents and grandparents.

Parental responsibility and vigilance end only when parents close their eyes in death.

Neither age nor accomplishments of the children will absolve parents from watching over them. As the children grow up the dangers and temptations become more numerous and stronger. Hence greater watchfulness is required over a son or daughter of twenty years than over one of ten. Physical size and strength will no more help the children than will their knowledge of right and wrong. Does the simple knowledge of right and wrong ever influence us to do what is right? We need a strong will, fortified by divine grace, to help us do right. The will of children is not so mature as ours, nor is their knowledge fortified with the experience we have. Why then expect more from children than from ourselves?

But, some will say, to constantly watch over children appears as though one were unwilling to trust them, to place them upon their honor. This objection will at once be recognized as invalid, if it is remembered that the parents are asked to watch over their children in order to protect them, to keep them from harm, to prevent them from going wrong.

You know that there is a God watching over all of us. He watches over us day and night for the sake of protecting and guiding us. He wants to be ever ready to help us in doing good and in avoiding evil.

Again you see how your work, your care and vigilance in behalf of your children renders you like to God in the eyes of your children. The very fact that God has entrusted to you children with immortal souls requires you to watch over them, in the name and authority of God.

The old saying that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure applies especially to your watchfulness over your children. You will invariably find it harder to correct misconduct on the part of your children than to prevent it from the beginning. Your watchfulness should be such that you prevent wrongdoing of your children than to correct it after it has taken place.

To make your vigilance as successful as it should be, it will be your duty to know everything about your children.

It is your sacred duty to know with whom your children go and play. If there is any valid reason why your children should not go with certain playmates it is your duty to forbid your children to associate with them and to take care that your order is obeyed. If you notice in your marriageable daughters an inclination to make eyes at any young man who may happen along, it is your duty to step in and forbid it. If your sons associate with wicked boys, call

a halt. Assert your full authority in such things and deal with them so severely that the children will be compelled to obey.

Parents must prevent indecency to poison the tender hearts of their children. Boys and girls in a family should be given separate sleeping-rooms. It may not always be possible to give a separate room to each child, but there *must* be a separate room for the boys and their belongings and clothing, and one for the girls. It will never be good policy to let a hired man sleep with the boys, or the servant girl with your daughters, unless you are absolutely certain of their good character.

Parents often take too much for granted. Boys as well as girls may be secretly doing sinful things. Convince yourselves that your children are not guilty of such hideous things by watching them when they think themselves alone and unobserved.

If a child is listless, abstracted, and fond of seclusion, you may do well to watch it; find out what the child is doing when alone. If it does no wrong so much the better. But if upon your sudden entrance you see the child bewildered and nervous you have reason to fear that something is wrong, and you must investigate to learn the whole truth.

I wish I could spare your feelings in this matter, but I should fail in my sacred duty if I should fail to point out to you your responsibility in this very matter. It is your duty to convince yourselves whether your growing sons are guilty of secret sins. If they are innocent and pure, thank God for it and do all you can that they may remain so. If you find your son's conduct sinful you must resort to severity and use your utmost effort to eradicate the evil.

A remark must here be made about reading. Your children are in great danger of being corrupted by bad reading. You may say

you have not a single bad book or paper in the house. Thank God if that is the case. But it may be suggested to inspect the beds of your sons and daughters to see whether they have not a book under the pillow they will not want you to see. That bad book is read while you fondly think your children are soundly sleeping. Such things have happened many times and you might as well be sure in this matter.

Allow only the best of books and papers in your home. See to it that you have Catholic story books, magazines and papers for your children to read. The less they see of daily papers the better it will be for them. Details about crimes, murders and divorce trials are not the reading matter that will keep children virtuous.

There will be little use of being watchful if you permit your children to lie to you. Make it plain to them that they cannot deceive or lie to you without being caught. And when you catch your children lying, give them such a punishment that they will not try it again.

I trust that I have made it plain to you how important it is for you to be always watching over your children so that you may prevent wrongdoing rather than be called upon to correct it.

Act with the authority that is given you by God Almighty, and make your children understand that in watching over all their doings you are doing what God requires of you for their temporal and eternal welfare.

XLVIII. Guidance

Vigilance over your children is only half of your task. It is equally important for you to be a guide for them.

We pity children who are bereft of their parents. These unfortunate children will have to pass through the dangerous years of youth, the time of greatest temptations, without the help of the guiding hand of father or mother. In the very years in which they are to decide upon the course of their life, the choice of vocation, their partners in marriage, they are without the ones who would advise them properly and guide them safely. And, alas, we have more reason at times to pity children who have parents that do almost less for their little ones than do strangers for orphans. At least we may hope that dead parents will pray for the children they have left behind. But many living parents do not even do that much. There are thousands of fathers who boast that they have provided amply for their children, boast of giving their children the best of food, shelter and clothing, and think they are doing remarkably well. To this they add what they call an "education," with a high school course thrown in. Is there anything else they might have done for their children? Let us see. The birds provide for all the wants of their little ones. The parent bird must hustle for food, and they feed their little ones before they eat. Parents do not do a bit more for their children than do the birds for their young ones. And what of the education? An education without religion may make people smart but not good. Hence parents cannot say they have done their whole duty if they only do as much as birds do for their young; nor can they say they have done all when they have given their children an education. A duty far more important is

being overlooked by such parents. They must be the guides of their children.

What the parish priest is for his parishioners the fathers must be for their children. The priest is not only the spiritual father of his people, the dispenser of the Sacraments, but their guide upon the road of salvation. So, too, you fathers are to be not only the givers of the natural lives of your children, not only the dispensers of food and clothing, but the real guides and teachers of your children.

You yourselves did not find the way of salvation by your own efforts. Time was when you were little children, and a pious father and mother taught you how to make the sign of the Cross, and to say your prayers. When you folded your tiny hands and began to say the Lord's prayer you did not understand the full meaning of all the words. Even now you find new meanings and new lessons in them. But when you were little you had to learn the prayers by heart, and the rest would all come in the course of time. You had to be brought to the Confessional and to the altar railing, not that you understood everything as well as you do now; but you had to be guided and led the right way. And had you not been guided by good and faithful parents you would never have learned your religion.

In your childish impulses you often felt inclined to do wrong; not because you understood the wrong of sin, but just to give vent to impulses that come from our evil inclinations. You had no intention of being full of malice or spite, but simply wanted to do as you saw others do. It required a strong "no" from your fathers to call you to duty, and now you are grateful to them for it.

In the course of time you discovered that your father meant it when he said "no." You found out that bad behavior made your

father angry, and that you received punishment if you repeated your offense. Then it was you began to weigh your words and deeds. You found out it was far better to do what you were told than to do something contrary to the wishes or commands of your father. To do wrong meant you would suffer for it; to do right meant you would be praised by your father. You see how your fathers guided you to do right, even before you were able to understand the full difference between right and wrong.

Now it is your duty to do the very same for your children. The task itself should be very hard if you recall how your fathers kept you from going wrong. Possibly their method was rather severe. Let it be that. If it was effective in making and keeping you good, why should it not be a good system to use for your children. If you were brought up well, use the same method for your children. The old way of bringing up children well, as you were brought up, is a reasonable one, because children have not changed, nor has human nature.

Children of to-day are of the same human nature as you, they have the same weaknesses, trials, temptations, the same impulses, the same inclinations to evil you experienced in your day. Human nature is the same throughout all times. Your children give you no problems that you have not given to your parents. Hence it should appear reasonable that you train your children and guide them in the same way in which you were brought up by your good parents. If you do as well with your children as your good parents have done with you, you need not worry about the outcome. With the same material and the same means the result will be the same.

A young tree that inclines to one side will not grow up straight by its own efforts. It must be bent and held to something

stronger and straighter than itself while still young, and it will in course of time grow up straight as it should.

Children are like such young trees. They need a strong support, a safe and able guide or, like trees, they will grow up the wrong way.

In the days of early childhood, the laying of the foundations for building up a good character will take place. In the first place you must try to curb and control the evil inclinations, the result of original sin, and then you must make the child cultivate virtue.

As to forming good habits in the heart of the child care should be taken that you learn the predominant fault of the child. That, no doubt, you will learn from being with the child. In all probability, you or your wife, or both of you, had the same chief fault and even now you must be on your guard lest this old weakness of yours may crop out again. To curb such a fault you must induce the child to practise the opposite virtue. That particular virtue will seem the hardest for the child, but it might as well begin with this one, hard though it is, for all the rest of virtues combined will never amount to much unless that particular virtue gets a good foothold first. This task of guidance will often be very discouraging. But if the constant drop of water is able to hollow a stone, why should your constant efforts of guidance not succeed? The heart of your child is not hard like a rock, but soft as wax.

Remember your parents had the very same troubles with you. The very moment sailors give up courage and the hope of saving the ship it is bound to go down. So long as the sailors still man the pumps and work hard, the chances are they can save a ship and their lives; but let them give up hope and effort and all is lost.

Soils differ and so do children. We cannot raise plants and flowers the same way in every soil. But the man of wisdom will

ascertain how flowers and plants will grow upon one soil, and how they may be made to grow on another soil. So must the treatment differ with children. In most cases gentleness but insistence will bring about the desired results, but in some cases severity will be called for to do the work.

It requires good judgment aided by experience to know how best to guide your children. Study the dispositions of your children, their ways, their weaknesses, as well as their good qualities, that you may know how to lead and guide them successfully.

XLIX. Vocations

Sooner or later your children will begin to talk about their future calling. You will discover a leaning of children towards some certain vocation even in their play and study. You will hear them speak of the future especially during the last years of school. It is natural that they should do so. For one thing the matter of vocation is explained to your children in their sodality meetings as your duties are being explained to you in these conferences.

Hence you need not be surprised to hear your children talk about this important matter. Your children may have some indefinite idea about their vocations, but hesitate to tell you. At any rate, it will be your duty to call their attention to the matter of vocation and ask them whether they have any plans or ideas about what should be their life work.

In many instances boys will follow the trades of their fathers, and girls the work of their mothers, but there are exceptions and a son may want to do work differing from that of his father. In all such cases it is the duty of parents to try and discover the will of God and do all in their power that their children may follow the calling God has intended for them.

There is first of all the religious vocation. It may be that your son wishes to be a priest. You may have observed him playing priest. If you have reasons to believe that he is sincere about it, encourage him as well as you can. The question whether you may be able to send your boy to college will take care of itself, if you let God in His love and providence guide you. If it is God's will that your boy should be a priest, He will find ways and means to see your boy through the college and seminary course. The father of the saintly Pope Pius X. died when he was a boy, just beginning

his college course. His poor mother was left with a household of little ones. Her relatives advised her to keep the boy home that he might go to work and help her. But the mother was firm in her determination to see her son a priest. She told her relatives that if it be God's will that her son should be a priest He will find a way to help both her and her son.

The result of this confidence in God was that this poor widow gave to the Church one of her greatest popes. God never forsakes those who love Him and who bring sacrifices for His sake.

One of your daughters may want to enter a convent. At once there is lamentation as though your daughter had done or said something most dreadful. It is strange, indeed, how queer some parents are. If their daughter was to marry some drunkard all the household may be happy, even though they know their daughter will have hell on earth. But anyhow she will have a husband. There are parents who would rather see their daughter die than to have her enter the convent. Such parents do not deserve to have children. If God selects one of your children for His special service you should feel grateful and honored. If God thinks that one of your boys has the proper qualifications for a priest, or one of your daughters should be a nun, you should feel proud of it that God has seen fit to take one of your own flesh and blood for His special service.

Other parents sin in the opposite direction. From motives of supposed piety they imagine their son must be a priest, or one of their daughters must enter the convent.

If you are good parents your main object will be to see that your children are made happy. The only way children will be happy is to have them be what they want to be, and what God wants them to be. To compel them to enter convents when they have no voca-

tion for convent life, or keep them from the convent when it is their vocation, or to compel a young man to become a priest against his wishes, or to keep another son away from the altar although he desires nothing more than to serve God in the sanctuary, is nothing else but making the lives of your children most miserable—miserable, may be, for all eternity. It is almost impossible to gain our salvation in any but the calling for which God has fitted us with His graces. What, then, should be done? When you are reasonably certain that your son or daughter has a vocation for the religious life, and with the help of your parish priest you will soon learn this, you simply say with Job: "The Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken; blessed be His holy name." Make all necessary arrangements that God's will may be carried out. Here again the priest will be glad to be of help to you.

For the majority of boys and girls God has intended the married state as their vocation, and here again it will be necessary for you to see that your children may not make a mistake in their choice. This brings us to the second class of vocations, the married state.

It is the solemn duty of you, fathers, you, Catholic men, to see to it that your growing sons and daughters may not entertain friendships with young people not of our holy Faith, for that might pave the way for a mixed marriage. You must do all in your power to prevent mixed marriages, because nine out of ten always end disastrously for the Catholic party.

Your sons and daughters need advice in this important question, and you must give it to them without arousing this antagonism. This will require a great deal of tact, patience and good judgment. The fact that your daughter has picked a Catholic young man is not always enough. She may be blind in her choice and it is your duty to see whether her choice is really a happy one. Not every

Catholic young man will be a proper husband for your daughter. It will be your duty to see whether he is of good character. Be on your guard. It is far more easy to prevent unhappiness than to remedy it.

One common-sense rule to follow will be to make sure that the young man who comes to call upon your daughter is a member of the young men's society of your parish. Any young man who is a member in good standing of this society may be regarded as a young man of good character. If he were not a good young man, leading an honorable life, you would not find him at the altar rail every month. The young men of shady reputation do not receive the Sacraments every month, they have no time to attend conferences, monthly meetings; they have no money for monthly dues, because they spend it elsewhere, in bad houses and the like; they have no use for the company of the good young men in the club-rooms, but spend their money in barrooms and worse places. That kind of a young man will not be the one to make your daughter happy.

We priests take special pains with sodalities for young men and young women. We spend time giving conferences and train them to receive the Sacraments frequently and regularly. We think it worth while to undertake this work for the sake of God's glory, and the welfare of the souls of your sons and daughters. It is God's wish and the wish of your priest; it is your wish as well, that your children should grow up pure, that they should grow up free from the terrible sins against chastity that nowadays are only too common.

When we priests see a young man or a young woman of the parish staying away from the Sacraments for months and months, or refuse to join the sodality to which they should belong, we fear

the worst. A pure young man, a pure young woman, have nothing to hide. Therefore they are always at hand to receive the Sacraments and to attend conferences and meetings. Not the good but the bad stay away from the Sacraments. This ought to be a warning for you. If one of your sons or daughters fail to receive the Sacraments with their sodalities, it will be time for you to learn the reason. Encourage your sons and daughters to be faithful members of their sodalities. By that fact you will know that they are still pure at heart.

You see, then, that the mere fact of a young man being a Catholic is by no means enough to recommend him as your future son-in-law. His best recommendation will be a membership in good standing in his sodality.

By socials, entertainments, card parties, and excursions the parish priest arranges for the young men and young women to get acquainted with one another. It is well for parents to support such parish gatherings by seeing that their sons and daughters attend them. And, to be sure, attend them yourselves. Many parents grow out of touch with their growing children. In most cases it would be of benefit if parents were to do considerable visiting among their friends, the homes of other sons and daughters. On such visits they should bring their sons and daughters so that the young people may get acquainted. Invite the parents whose sons and daughters you should like to see enter your family. When parents never visit any one, never entertain any one, the children are of necessity compelled to look out for themselves and they may not always be fortunate in their choice. They may be led to judge by appearances, and make a mistake. You are not living for yourselves but for your children.

For that reason take a lively interest in the welfare of your

children and let them know it by giving them timely instructions concerning the duties of their future life. You will again and again lay stress upon religion to show your sons and daughters that without religion it is impossible to gain any happiness, even here below. Many things will occur that you may use as examples. Happenings found in the daily papers, such as murders, suicides, divorces, thefts and so forth, all can be used as lessons for children to show that absence of religion and crime go together.

Above all, warn your sons and daughters against entering hasty or secret marriages; forbid them to meet young people of the opposite sex away from home. Do not make the mistake of encouraging your children to marry for money, just because you have saved up a few pennies. Love and happiness cannot be bought with money. Parents who attempt to force their daughters to marry only a man who has wealth regardless of any other consideration, cannot blame children when they take matters in their own hands and marry whom they see fit. You often see girls of marriageable age on the way to be old maids. They are exemplary girls and would make any decent man a good wife; but their parents found fault with the young men that came to see them. They were good young men at that, industrious and well behaved, but they lacked money, the thing her parents valued more than a good reputation, and thus these girls missed their best chances.

When you discover that your son or daughter intend to marry someone who you know will cause nothing but disgrace and misery, you will have to be extremely careful in advising at the right time, place and manner, so that your child may not become headstrong and do the very thing that is to be avoided. You may easily make matters worse instead of better.

One good way of giving advice will be to ask them to go with

you to Holy Communion. Then you may talk to them in all earnestness and sincerity. Needless to say, prayer should not be forgotten. In very difficult cases, when you seem to be at a loss to know what to do or say, it may be well to ask the advice of the parish priest. He will either take the matter in hand himself, or he will be able to give you proper advice.

There is no problem more difficult facing you than the question of the vocation of your children, because upon it will hinge your happiness, and their temporal and eternal welfare. That is the reason why you should help to solve this question when the time comes. And the matter will not be so very hard if you go about it in the right way. Lead your children up to this great question of vocation gradually, until they can see it in all its importance. Show them the consequences of a happy choice, and what life and death has in store for them if they choose unwisely. Warnings and advice will then be taken in good part and your children will do the right thing.

Next to your own righteousness nothing will please you more upon your dying day than to see your children happy for time and eternity. Hence leave nothing undone to help them make the right choice.

L. The Man of Faith

Now that we have reviewed the various duties which a father of a family owes to his wife and children, we shall briefly consider the things he owes to himself.

We have in some of our earlier conferences referred to the lack of Faith in present-day society. We saw how infidelity and Godlessness vitiates politics, the social and business life, and especially education.

Saint Joseph was held up to you as the model of Faith, and you were asked to pray to him that through his mighty intercession and example we, too, might be men of living Faith. By imitating this wonderful saint in his living Faith the Catholic men of the twentieth century will be able to do much to rescue society from the dangers of infidelity to which it is exposed.

You Catholic men must be the leaven that is to ferment the whole world; Catholic men must be the salt of the earth; for, if you too should fail in your duties, who else will be there to do the work of God?

You must, therefore, be men of living Faith. To be such you must know your religion well. As fathers of families you are the first and most important teachers of your children. The school will teach your children a small part compared with that what you must teach your children. You are to teach Faith to your children; and you will not be able to teach your children religion unless you know it yourselves.

Anything you understand perfectly you will be able to explain clearly. If you know not the construction of a steam engine you cannot, of course, explain it to others. You must not only have a general idea about religion, but know it thoroughly. You must

be able to explain it so that it meets all objections that can be reasonably made, must be able to give your reasons for your belief, and in this way you will be able to explain the faith so lucidly that your children can understand you.

Above all, encourage the children to ask questions, and when they ask them give your whole attention to them and answer them fully, and so that the child is fully enlightened on the point on which it sought information.

You must know your religion well not only for the sake of your children, but also for the sake of the people with whom you come in contact.

You cannot hide your faith if you make an earnest effort to live up to your religion. Of course there are cases where people will live side by side, and work side by side for years without knowing each other's religion. In those cases the command of Christ of letting our light shine is scarcely observed. The light is kept under a bushel. If you live up to your holy Faith, people will know that you are a Catholic. Then, as a matter of course, you will be asked questions about your Faith. You will hear objections which you will have to answer. You will learn that people of a different or of no religion have false notions about God, the holy sacrifice of Mass, indulgences, the veneration of saints, and other matters which you will be able to explain to them if you know your holy Faith. The leading topics of the day, such as socialism and the like, should be well understood that you may be able to distinguish truth from error. You need not be deep thinkers or scholars to distinguish in popular questions of the day error from truth. If you keep in mind the elementary truths of our Holy Faith, if you have a fair knowledge of the catechism and of Bible history, you will be

able to form a correct judgment in matters concerning religion, education, etc.

When people tell you that with the help of socialism they can make this earth into a Heaven you are able to explain what Heaven really means and what have been the consequences of sin for man. People will be as unable to prevent poverty and want as they are of preventing the seasons from coming around in their turn. When people talk of uplift work, tell them what is the basis of true morality. There can be no uplift work, no true morality, without God. Always try and pick out the kernel of truth and show people what is error. Needless to say, this must be done in a kind and charitable way if it is to do any good.

When people know you are a Catholic, but find you unwilling or unable to give an answer, they put you down as a coward or an ignoramus. True, people may not always agree with you. Prejudice and bigotry may prevent them from seeing their errors; but they will admire you because they cannot help but admire manliness. If, however, they find you a coward or an ignoramus, they have only contempt for you, and it is what you deserve.

It will not be enough for you to *know* your faith; you will have to *live* it every day of your life. Faith without the words of faith is dead as a tree is dead when it fails to bring forth leaves and fruit. A dead tree is no ornament, nor is a dead faith.

A living faith means that you observe faithfully the laws of God and holy Church, that you live up to the duties of your state of life, as husband and father. Faith obliges you to be law abiding and loyal to our country, to be honest and fair in your dealings with your fellow man, whether Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or pagan. The virtues of justice, of purity, of charity and of peace should place their stamp upon you and upon all your actions.

Let us look at the question of faith from another point of view, that we may the better appreciate its great importance.

We live in a world that appears as the only real thing, because we can feel and see and hear it. And yet this world is only temporary. There is a life beyond, a Heaven we have never seen, a God whom we have never seen or heard; we are told of an eternal punishment awaiting all those who lived and died in mortal sin, and yet no living human being has ever seen what this place of punishment looks like; we are told of purgatory, and yet we never saw it or heard where it was, or what punishment is dealt out there. We are living in a real but passing world, and at the same time our Faith is so powerful that we live in a spirit world at the same time. The life to come, the reward of Heaven we have never seen wields an influence that makes us lose sight of this real but passing world, to look up to another we know only by faith.

By faith the present real world, the substance, becomes the shadow and the future world, now only a shadow, becomes the substance. Things earthly, like honors, wealth and pleasures, appear to us as vain, unable to fully satisfy us, while the reward which eye has not seen or ear heard, is more real and certain for us than anything this world could place into our possession.

We see people about us craving for earthly things, and they will endure almost anything to gain those glittering bubbles of honor, riches or pleasure! You see people working and slaving, denying themselves every comfort, going hungry, in order to save up money; and before they can enjoy the fruits of their economy and thrift they die. You see people sacrificing honor and friendship to gain the applause of the world; but before they can enjoy the praise of the world they die. The world and its votaries, what are they? Look at a burning candle on a hot summer's night. How the bugs

flutter around the flame, until they approach too near to the flame and it singes their wings. Does that teach them a lesson? No; they flutter around that flame until the flame kills them. Such is the world.

By the wonderful power of faith we are able to see through all this hollow mockery of the world, we are able to see the vanity of all things earthly. We live, and work, and struggle, and even die if need be, for a Kingdom not of this world, a Kingdom which even if we have not seen it we are certain of because we believe God. Our senses, our eyes and ears, may deceive us—all earthly knowledge is fallible. Alone faith is infallible. You may hear people say they can surely believe their eyes. Let us see. You stand upon a railway track where you see a straight track ahead of you for a mile. Your eyes tell you the two rails meet to form but one rail. Your eyes have deceived you; the rails do not meet at all. They are just as far apart a mile away as they are where you stand.

Look up to the example of good St. Joseph.

Let us not only admire his unfailing faith but imitate it. His faith was tested more severely than yours and mine will ever be. Yet he was unswerving in devotion and loyalty to God, staunch as a rock in temptations and trials. Such faith should be our faith, and hence we men should pray to this hero of the faith that our faith may never fail. Let us, too, be loyal and devoted to God in our holy faith, that finally together with St. Joseph we may dwell in the eternal home of our Heavenly Father, in the glorious Kingdom to come.

LI. The Man of Prayer

A Catholic husband and father must be a man of prayer. Natural, though, it should be for such a man to pray. We often find men—Catholic men—who find time for all things but prayer. Prayer they leave to their wives and children. But, since the man must travel the same road to Heaven which his wife and children travel, and that being the road to prayer, it is necessary for a man to pray. In the command to pray our dear Lord did not exempt the men. Men must pray the same as women and children. All are equally bound to pray in order to be saved.

Prayer is by no means incompatible with the work of men. Whether he be emperor or beggar, scientist or workman, a man is bound to pray and will find the time for it if he has the will. Where there is a will there is a way. The examples of kings like St. Wenzeslaus, and of a poor farm laborer like St. Isidore, show you how prayer is befitting king and beggar. You may say: "These were saints and they could do a great deal better than we ordinary folks can do." This reasoning has not the least weight, and to show you that even men not canonized by the Church can be men of prayer I will give you an example from the life of a physician. Generally one thinks a physician has less time for prayer than any other man. It was my good fortune to know a physician whose love of prayer shone forth most wonderfully in our worldly age. In his profession he ranked very high. In his practise he was very successful, in surgery there were few that could compete with him. And he was a very busy man.

Here was his daily rule: Every morning he heard Mass at six o'clock. Even if he reached home from a call at five he did not go to bed, but waited up so be could attend the six o'clock Mass. Every

day he said the rosary for his patients. People said of him that he prayed his patients back to health. Nor was this all. He never undertook an operation unless he first went to receive Holy Communion. Since he had to operate very often, he received nearly every day. Holy Communion he would offer up for the patient upon whom he was to operate that day, so that the undertaking might be successful. Many a dying man and woman was baptized by him in the hour of death. To dying non-Catholic patients he would speak about God and help them make an act of contrition for their sins. If they desired Baptism he would baptize them if there was danger, otherwise he would ask the parish priest to go to these people to give them instruction.

With his reputation for learning and success it was no wonder that he had more work to do than he was well able to perform. Overwork and exposure finally broke down his health.

With death staring him in the eyes for months he lived and suffered in resignation to the will of his loving God. His death was as edifying as was his life. His was as perfect a life as I have ever known one, and all who had the honor of knowing this saintly doctor feel that he is one of the thousands of saints the Church has in all times and places, and whose memory is honored on the first of November when all the saints, both known and unknown, are held up to us as our models.

No matter what our position in life may be, whether we are rich or poor, young or old, high or low, all of us without exception are in need of prayer, because that is the only prop that will keep us up. The burdens which our life and duty bring with them, the trials and temptations we have to meet and overcome, the sorrows and sufferings we must undergo as a penalty for sin, all would be unsupportable were it not for prayer. Without the help of prayer our

existence would spell despair on earth, and hell hereafter. How grateful we should be to God for permitting us to speak to Him, to pray to Him.

To show your love of prayer, pray together with your family as often as you can. If it is at all possible have all the family gather for morning and night prayers. Let those prayers take from five to ten minutes. During Lent and Advent it will be praiseworthy indeed if you all say each evening the rosary. And while the prayers are said teach by your own earnestness and piety the children to be devout. And do not let the presence of guests interfere with family prayers at meals or other times. Do not be cowards before God or men.

I need hardly tell you that you should help the children to learn their prayers by heart. You and especially your wife will have to say those prayers so often that your children will learn them by heart from hearing. You will instruct your children that prayer is absolutely necessary for salvation, but all your instruction will help very little unless you preach to them by the force of your own good example.

Moreover, how can you expect your sons and daughters frequently at the altar rail unless you, the fathers, give them the good example! You want your sons and daughters to be members in good standing in their sodalities, and you know they cannot remain good and pure unless they go to the altar railing regularly. Give them the good example by receiving Holy Communion with the Men's Society of the Holy Name.

To see a long line of married men approach the altar rail every month, to see the men come to the Sunday services, conferences, evening devotions, to see them take a lively interest in all parish

work, the compelling force of such an example is a more eloquent sermon than the children could ever hear from the pulpit.

As Catholic men you must be men of prayer. You owe it to yourselves as well as to your children that prayer should be one of your strongest virtues. And since our whole life is nothing but a preparation for death, we cannot start preparing for our last hour any too soon. In all my priestly experience I have yet to see the first case in which a Catholic fond of prayer had a bad end. Hence, for the take of your eternal welfare, be men of prayer.

LII. The Man of Honor

People devoid of religion have rarely a good conception of honor. They often have the opinion that all things and actions are good and lawful if they lead to success and wealth. As long as a man is not caught in the meshes of the law he is likely to be considered by the world an honorable man.

Making unlawful gain in political office is considered quite permissible. And the question arises, why not do as others do?

Business corruption is also the common thing. Few great business ventures are to-day honestly conducted. Watered stock, worthless shares, wild-cat mining schemes are the order of the day. The man who cleverly carries them through is a great financier, a captain of industry; the men who are cheated are the foolish victims, who deserve what they got because they had the same intention—of getting rich at the expense of others instead of by honest labor.

There are physicians who for the sake of making money will murder unborn babes. Some few of them are clumsy enough to be caught; others are highly respected and successful practitioners! We have lawyers who for the sake of money will handle the most disreputable cases. They will shield the criminal, provided he has the means, and permit the innocent party to suffer. We have business men who are flagrantly dishonest in their dealings, yet are never caught and pose as models of civic virtue; and there are workingmen who are dishonest in their work.

The standard which the world sets up as honorable is nothing but hypocrisy. In His day Christ dealt with the same kind of "honorable" men. He called them hypocrites, whitened sepulchres, beautiful to behold from the outside, but within full of corruption. The Pharisees were men of honor and renown in their day, models of

saintliness. But our Lord could read their hearts. They knew it and in return hated Jesus. They plotted and schemed until they had Him upon the cross.

The standard of honor and morality God sets up is not the standard the world admires. You Catholic men, the fathers of respectable families, should be men of true honor. The world may call you great or not; that matters very little. What does matter is that God is satisfied with your idea of honor.

To be real men of honor do not make more debts than you can pay. Never crowd your credit and see that you are able to meet your bills the day they are due. When people learn that your word is as good as your bond, you will never lack for credit. Even though you do low and humble work, do that work so well and conscientiously that your employer will never want a better man than you. A man who demands good wages must in return give good work. To give less is nothing else but plain stealing. Hence consider it a matter of honor to turn out the best work you can. This is the best way of putting yourself in a better position. The competent workman will be picked out to be foreman; the most competent foreman will be made manager of a department, and a competent manager of a department will be in a position either to start in business for himself or to be taken in as partner by his employer.

The workingman who fears he is doing too much and making his employer too rich will always remain at the bottom of the ladder. Be your business ever so little or so great, be honest in all things and you will deserve to be called men of honor in the sight of God.

Be men of honor politically.

Never permit a ward-heeler to give you a glass of beer or a cigar in payment for your vote. Read reliable papers and books about

the political questions. You will then be able to vote intelligently. We govern ourselves, and if through our venality, cowardice or ignorance we permit dishonest men to become makers and administrators of our laws, before God *we* are responsible for this outrage upon justice.

Be sure the men you are voting for are men of tried courage, honor and ability. Whether such a candidate be upon the ticket of your favorite party or on another ticket matters little; vote for the *man*. If every man would act in accordance with his conscience we should not have a single incompetent or dishonest official to disgrace our fair country. But because many voters are ignorant, indifferent or mercenary we have some officials for whom we must hide our heads in shame. Let the majority of voters wake up to their solemn duty; let them be aware of the fact that one day they must account to God for every vote they cast, and the majority of voters will quickly oust every incompetent and dishonest man from office.

To see corruption in some cities that have a vast Catholic vote does not throw a favorable light upon our Catholic citizenship. There must be a hitch somewhere, some one is not doing his duty, or things would be different. Whenever a Catholic citizen aspires for a prominent office, what happens? At once the anti-Catholic societies—most of them of a secret character—get busy and unanimously work against that candidate.

But where is the Catholic organization? What is the Catholic voter doing? Anti-Catholic societies will have a big campaign fund, will rent large halls in every town and city, will engage speakers of national fame, will hand out books and pamphlets, will organize young men into political clubs, while our Catholic voters are asleep. Our Catholic voters will even go so far as to support the political

party that stands under the protection of anti-Catholic societies instead of voting for the Catholic candidate.

Some Catholic voters say they will not mix religion with politics! But the others are doing this. Anti-Catholic societies will not vote for a man who is a Catholic, be he otherwise ever so honest and capable.

We have parish societies, we have a few clubs here and there, but nowhere is there a nation-wide organization that will fight bigotry at election times—just the time it should be fought unsparingly. Our Catholic press is by no means taking the position it should occupy, for lack of funds and encouragement. The man who will bring about an assertion of the Catholic claims in this regard will be the greatest Catholic of this twentieth century. Whether he is born—who knows! Let us pray to God to speed the day of his coming.

In the meantime much good can be done if you Catholic men and voters will be honorable in matters of politics, and if you learn to stand together. This will pave the way for an organization nation-wide in scope. Prepare the way for the Daniel O'Connell or Windhorst of our country.

Be at all times true to your friends. But do not become dishonest to shield an evil-doer because in times past he called you his friend. They who abuse your trust and friendship have no right to expect, and those who are found dishonorable are not worthy to be called friends. Do not stand between such men and justice.

No man can be saved unless he is willing to be saved. Grace does not compel us to be good; neither have you the power of compelling others to be good and true.

If you want to have good friends be a good friend to others. Be

a man of honor and you will never lack friends equally as honorable and true as you. They will take pride in calling you their friend.

Honor, like cleanliness, is a distinction all, even the poorest of the poor, can claim as their own. A man may be so poor that he has but one suit of clothes. Yet that suit should be clean and neat. Our reputation for honor is just like a suit of clothes. If we really desire a good reputation it will be our endeavor to keep it clean. It will be our constant care to avoid places, things and work that might sully that reputation.

Be men of unsullied honor. Let your light shine, your light of honor and faithfulness, that people may praise and thank God for being privileged to call you their friend. The meaning of the word Catholic should include the meaning, in the best sense, of the word gentleman.